

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to allocate housing appropriations upon the basis of need and of present population; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass necessary amendments to the GI bill of rights whereby veterans in accredited schools shall receive monthly benefits for each calendar month until their graduation or severance from said school; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 5368. A bill for the relief of W. G. Magruder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 5369. A bill for the relief of Andrew W. Peterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5370. A bill for the relief of the widow of Reuben Malkin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CRAVENS:

H. R. 5371. A bill for the relief of Marvin Pettus; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 5372. A bill for the relief of Jessie Wolfington; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENDRICKS:

H. R. 5373. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Elizabeth Campbell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 5374. A bill for the relief of John Camara; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 5375. A bill for the relief of Francis Sopko; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 5376. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1519. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, requesting the Congress of the United States to pass necessary amendments to the GI bill of rights whereby veterans in accredited schools shall receive monthly benefits for each calendar month until their graduation or severance from said school; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1520. By Mr. EBERHARTER: Petition of 1,000 citizens of western Pennsylvania, on anti-labor legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

1521. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Mrs. George W. Rollins, and others of Douglas County, Mo., urging a favorable vote on the Bryson bill, H. R. 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1946

(Legislative day of Friday, January 18, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, whose throne standest steadfast and sure, even as on this our spinning habitation in the vastness men's hearts fail for fear, into Thy hands of love we commit ourselves and our troubled world. In this great day of our opportunity, Thou hast set us tasks which test all our courage, trust, and fidelity. May we be strong to do the things which need to be done and to put aside the things which are unworthy or belittling or base. Grant us vision to follow in faith Thy ways of love and truth until our lives become Thy revelation and Thy spirit touches into the beauty of holiness our thoughts and deeds. We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT
PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1946.
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN H. BANKHEAD, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BANKHEAD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

EDWARD P. CARVILLE, a Senator from the State of Nevada, appeared in his seat today.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 102. An act to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act;

S. 765. An act concerning the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic region of the Western Hemisphere, for the purpose of improving the weather-forecasting service within the United States and on the civil international air transport routes from the United States;

S. 1467. An act to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations of un-

paid balances in the pay accounts of naval personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; and

S. 1631. An act to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 50) to permit settlement of accounts of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and of deceased commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, without administration of estates, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1519. An act relating to marine insurance in the case of certain employees of the War Department who suffered death, injury, or other casualty prior to April 23, 1943, as a result of marine risks;

H. R. 2764. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the utilization by freight forwarders of the services of common carriers by motor vehicle;

H. R. 4605. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents;

H. R. 4896. An act to provide for payment of travel allowances and transportation and for transportation of dependents of members of the naval forces, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 30 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the Senator proceeds, the Chair would like to lay before the Senate certain reports, and so forth, for appropriate reference, and there is other routine business which, if there is no objection, might be transacted at this time.

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SPECIAL ASSISTANTS, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1 to December 31, 1945, under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued

duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED SHIPYARDS AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Administrator of the Surplus Property Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report with respect to Government-owned shipyards and facilities (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMITTEE—TELEGRAM FROM DIALECTIC SENATE OF NORTH CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I have received a telegram from the Dialectic Senate of the University of North Carolina, which reads as follows:

CHAPEL HILL, N. C., February 4, 1946.

SENATOR JAMES M. MEAD,

United States Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Dialectic Senate of University of North Carolina voted overwhelmingly to condemn current Senate filibuster, and urge you to do all possible to bring FEPC to a vote now.

GLORIA CHAPMAN, Clerk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the telegram will be received and lie on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, favoring the enactment of the so-called Sumners-Capper resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 9, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant to the people of the District of Columbia representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas citizenship in our democracy endows each individual with rights and duties, among them the duty to participate in the conduct of our Government; and

Whereas the selection of public officers of our democracy by popular vote is one of the fundamental rights of every competent individual in our democracy; and

Whereas the denial of this right to the residents of the District of Columbia defeats the spirit and purpose of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of these United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People heartily endorses the Sumners-Capper resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 9, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant to the people of the District of Columbia representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President.

RETURN OF PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT OFFICES TO STATE OPERATION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate

reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the District of Columbia Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People at the Asbury Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., on January 27, 1946, favoring the enactment of the so-called Ramspeck bill, which is House bill 4437, to provide for the return of public employment offices to State operation, to amend the act of Congress approved June 6, 1933, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Federal control of the United States Employment Service is part of our national program of reconversion; and

Whereas uniform practices in employment throughout the country serve to make full use of our available labor supply and aid our efforts for full production in peacetime economy; and

Whereas the President of the United States has asked Congress to continue Federal control of the United States Employment Service until July 1947: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the District of Columbia Branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People endorses the Ramspeck bill, H. R. 4437, and urges its enactment into law.

APPROPRIATIONS

FEBRUARY 2, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee

who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Mamie L. Mizen.....	1434 Saratoga Ave.....	District of Columbia government.....	\$3,975

KENNETH McKELLAR, Acting Chairman.

INVESTIGATION OF SENATORIAL PRIMARIES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. GREEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 224), which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, from States in which no Senator is to be elected at the general election in 1946, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to—

(1) The extent and nature of the expenditures made by all candidates for the office of United States Senator in 1946 in connection with their campaigns for nomination and election to such office;

(2) The amounts subscribed and contributed, and the value of services rendered and facilities made available (including personal services, and the use of billboards and other advertising space, radio time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobiles and other transportation facilities), by any individual, group of individuals, partnership, association, or corporation to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign, or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any primary or general election, or at any convention, held in 1946, at which a candidate for United States Senator is to be nominated or elected;

(3) The expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress with a view to determining whether any such funds have been or are being expended by any department, independent agency, or instrumentality of the United States, by any State or political subdivision thereof, or by any instrumentality of any State or political subdivision thereof, in such a manner as to influence the votes cast or to be cast for any such candidate at any such primary or general election or convention;

(4) The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidate; and

(5) Such other matters relating to the election of United States Senators in 1946, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the Senate in enacting remedial legislation or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the Senate.

Sec. 2. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee, under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as

though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee, shall be public.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or the chairman of any duly authorized subcommittee thereof.

Sec. 4. The committee by majority vote may authorize any member of the committee, or any member of a duly authorized subcommittee, to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any member so authorized may hold public hearings, issue subpoenas and provide for the service thereof, require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents, administer oaths and take testimony.

Sec. 5. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may authorize any one or more persons to conduct on behalf of the committee any part of the investigation herein provided for, and for such purpose any person so authorized may hold such public hearings, issue such subpoenas and provide for the service thereof, require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, administer such oaths, and take such testimony, as the committee, or any such duly authorized subcommittee, may from time to time authorize.

Sec. 6. The committee shall report to the Senate on the first day of the next regular session of the Congress the results of its investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

COMMEMORATION OF ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF ADMISSION OF TENNESSEE AS A STATE

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 225), which was referred to the Committee on the Library:

Resolved, That on Saturday, June 1, 1946, at the conclusion of the morning business, the legislative business of the Senate be suspended for the purpose of permitting addresses to be delivered concerning the history of the State of Tennessee and its leaders, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the admission of Tennessee to the Union as a State.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARVILLE:

S. 1790. A bill to authorize the coinage of 10,000,000 silver 50-cent pieces in commemoration of Pearl Harbor; and

S. 1791. A bill to authorize the coinage of 10,000,000 silver dollars in commemoration of

the victorious conclusion of World War II; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1792. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer the name plate, ship's bell, and silver service of the U. S. S. *Nevada* to the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1793. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to Arnold L. Fast;

S. 1794. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mr. and Mrs. James Archdale; and

S. 1795. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in the State of Montana to M. J. Schwinden; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1796. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to provide transportation and monthly allowances for quarters for dependents of all enlisted personnel of the armed forces, for investigating housing for servicemen's dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CAPEHART) introduced Senate bill 1797, to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act for the purpose of permitting persons honorably discharged from the armed forces to wear their uniforms for a period of 6 months, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1798. A bill to repeal section 800 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; and

S. 1799. A bill to permit payment of veteran's unemployment readjustment allowances where his unemployment is due to a strike lasting more than five successive weeks; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1800. A bill for the relief of Gustavo Ferretti; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. TUNNELL:

S. 1801. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Delaware; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1802. A bill to provide for permanent preservation as historic relics of the silver service, ship's bell, and name plate from the battleship U. S. S. *Nevada*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 1803. A bill to eliminate certain oppressive labor practices affecting interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PERMISSION FOR DISCHARGED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES TO WEAR UNIFORMS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to permit honorably discharged war veterans to wear their uniforms for a period up to 6 months.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1797) to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act for the purpose of permitting persons honorably discharged from the armed forces to wear their uniforms for a period of 6 months, introduced by Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CAPEHART), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Small Business

Committee, I have just introduced for myself and for the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] a bill to amend the National Defense Act which will permit honorably discharged war veterans to wear their uniforms for a period up to 6 months. The existing statute, which has been on the books since its passage in 1916, permits an honorably discharged man to wear his uniform only from the place of his discharge to his home, and in no instance does it permit him to wear all or any part of his uniform for more than 3 months.

The bill which has just been introduced is brief and clear. It reads as follows:

That section 125 of the National Defense Act, approved June 3, 1916, as amended, is amended by striking out "nor to prevent any person who has been honorably discharged from the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, Regular or Volunteer, from wearing his uniform from the place of his discharge to his home, within 3 months after the date of such discharge" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "nor to prevent any person who has been honorably discharged, or relieved from active duty in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, Regular or Volunteer, from wearing his uniform at any time within a period of 6 months after the date of his discharge or relief from active duty, if he wears on such uniform such insignia as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to indicate that he has been honorably discharged from or relieved from active duty in the armed forces of the United States."

It will be noted that the principal change is one extending the time when the dischargee can wear his uniform under any condition for a period of 6 months after he leaves the service. Further provision is made for the wearing of such insignia as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy indicating that the veteran has been honorably discharged and has been relieved of active duty.

Mr. President, this bill grew out of hearings recently held by the Senate Small Business Committee to ascertain the reasons for the shortage of men's clothing, and to do what we could to remedy the situation. At those hearings the Civilian Production Administration, Office of Price Administration, Surplus Property Administration, and War and Navy Departments presented testimony—and leaders in the clothing industry were called upon. The serious plight of returning soldiers, sailors, and marines who cannot get even one civilian suit to put on in adjusting themselves to civilian life was brought out forcibly.

Over 5,000,000 men have already been released from the Army, 1,000,000 from the Navy and 200,000 from the Marine Corps. Many more thousands are being released daily. They need suits, overcoats, and other wearing apparel with which to outfit themselves for civilian life and civilian jobs. In addition to the need of our returned servicemen is that of the many millions of our citizens who have not been able to buy sufficient clothing during the war years.

Over against this need, which is estimated to be at least 40,000,000 suits of

clothing during 1946, there is an estimated production of 20,000,000 suits.

And this 20,000,000 can only be produced if labor shortages in the industry do not increase—and if the mill and the manufacturer cooperate in a production drive to provide the necessary types of fabric at the necessary price level.

During the conferences held by the Senate Small Business Committee, we were assured by Army and by Navy that their declarations of surplus fabrics and clothing were current and were being constantly scrutinized. Surplus Property Administration's testimony was not as assuring on the promptness with which they were getting declarations of surplus clothing and fabrics into wholesale and retail distribution channels.

The Senate Small Business Committee was pretty well satisfied that relatively little relief to the suit and coat shortage could be hoped for from these sources.

The problem is primarily one of production—and the direction of that production into the necessary channels.

Today the Civilian Production Administration emphasizes that up until VJ-day every possible textile loom and yard of fabric was devoted to filling the needs of the military—and they state that since August there has not been enough time for the industry to adjust itself fully to civilian production.

But last summer, the War Production Board—CPA's predecessor—was more hopeful, and issued press releases which stated that the clothing and textile industry, unhampered by war restrictions, would be able to concentrate on getting men's suits and coats on the racks by the middle of last November, in sufficient quantity to take care of veteran and essential civilian demand.

Those suits and coats have not been forthcoming, and the manufacturers, relieved from production and distribution controls, have found it more profitable to produce more expensive fabrics—with which to make more expensive suits—even if their production of such higher-priced merchandise is limited by OPA's pricing restrictions.

I ask, Mr. President, what average young man getting out of service can afford \$150 for a suit—if he can find one to buy?

The Civilian Production Administration has recently re-announced its low-cost clothing program with new schedules and new stipulations. A WPB-CPA low-cost clothing program has been in effect, in various forms, since May 1945. It has also reaffirmed its statement of policy to retailers asking them to cooperate in giving preference to veteran purchasers. The Office of Price Administration has also taken part in CPA's program by putting into effect certain price incentives which it is hoped may pry loose some of the much needed production.

The Civilian Production Administration has stated that their program should yield at least 50 percent of the desired production.

I am less hopeful that this renewed effort to make a voluntary low-cost clothing program work will have the desired results—at least not by the first and second quarters of 1946. Wartime

incentives are lacking, and the pressure on the market is spiralling upward into higher-priced clothing.

Labor shortages and work stoppages persist in the textile and clothing industry as they have persisted more or less throughout the war. Yet, according to a recent statement on January 22, 1946, by John W. Snyder, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the wool goods output prospect is not too dark. He said:

Worsted and woolen fabric production increased from a 1939 level of 372,000,000 yards to 536,000,000 in 1943. In 1945 production fell under 500,000,000 yards, but now that substantial change-overs to civilian fabrics have been made the rate of production should go up during 1946.

My argument, Mr. President, is that we will not be able to get enough production, even at peak, to take care of more than 50 percent of the demand that exists today, and we have no assurance by either CPA or OPA controls that we will have production of the types of woollens and at the lower prices that are so desperately needed.

I have called the attention of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion to this situation and have urged immediate consideration of a program that will require, first, that a larger proportion of woollens and other fabrics be allocated for the production of men's clothing; and, second, that Civilian Production Administration regulations stipulate that certain loom capacity must be devoted to the manufacture of the necessary weights of woollens within the low-price range.

In my opinion, an emergency still exists, and without such specific designation a low-cost clothing program is powerless and will continue to be evaded. In a few months 10,000,000 men will be clamoring for clothes—chaos, now in the making, will have arrived—and more stringent methods will have to be applied to remedy the situation.

By dealing forehandedly with it, adopting those measures which will most nearly prevent such conditions, we may avoid such dire consequences and our returning servicemen and other civilians may have the clothing they so badly need.

The bill, which I have introduced today, is a small but important part of the whole program. We in the Senate Small Business Committee urge its early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado will be received, referred to

the Committee on Banking and Currency, and printed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In this amendment I have completely rewritten section 2, so as to make provision for the British loan to be made directly by American subscribers, and giving to the American subscribers to such loan, in payment of their interest and principal, the amounts paid by the British Government on the loan. I should like to read the amendment:

SEC. 2. (a) In order to provide funds for carrying out the agreement dated December 6, 1945, between the United States and the United Kingdom, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to borrow, from time to time, not in excess of \$3,750,000,000, and to issue therefor bonds in the form and subject to the conditions hereinafter set forth. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use the proceeds of such bonds for the purpose of carrying out the agreement.

(b) Bonds issued pursuant to the authority of this section shall be subject to the same provisions for amortization and interest (including waiver of interest) as are provided in the agreement with respect to repayment by the United Kingdom. Payments on account of principal and interest shall be made solely from amounts paid by the United Kingdom under the agreement, but the United States shall be under no obligation to the holders of such bonds with respect to principal or interest.

(c) Bonds herein authorized shall from time to time be offered as a popular loan under such regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury as will in his opinion give the people of the United States as nearly as may be an equal opportunity to participate therein.

(d) Except as otherwise provided in this section, the bonds herein authorized shall be issued in the same manner, so far as is consistent with the provisions of this section, as bonds issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. They shall be of distinctive design and shall bear on their face a statement to the effect that they are not backed by the credit of, or guaranteed by, the United States.

(e) No payments shall be made to the United Kingdom under the agreement or this joint resolution except from the proceeds of bonds issued under the provisions of this section.

(f) Inasmuch as bonds issued under this section are not obligations of the United States, such bonds shall not be considered for the purpose of the debt limit of the United States.

(g) The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide by regulation for the distribution on an equitable basis among the holders of such bonds of payments of principal and interest received from the United Kingdom.

In brief, Mr. President, the amendment provides for a referendum among the people of the United States on the proposal for a British loan. I note from the press that the banks of this country have on deposit \$162,000,000,000. I note also today that the public debt of this country has risen to an all-time high of \$279,444,000,000. That indicates to me, at least, that there is money in this country to finance the loan, but that the money to finance the loan is not in the Treasury of the United States. In other words, the Treasury is worse than broke, and the people have the money. So why not submit this loan to the people with the money, instead of having the taxpayers of the country underwrite the loan?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, am I to understand that the Senator's proposal is to have the Treasury operate as an agency for the British Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And that the obligations which the Treasury would sell or offer for sale to the American people would be bonds issued with the full faith and credit of the British Government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Without imposing any obligation on the Treasury of the United States for their repayments?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is an interesting suggestion.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1519. An act relating to marine insurance in the case of certain employees of the War Department who suffered death, injury, or other casualty prior to April 28, 1943, as a result of marine risks; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 2764. An act to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, with respect to the utilization by freight forwarders of the services of common carriers by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. R. 4605. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 4896. An act to provide for payment of travel allowances and transportation and for transportation of dependents of members of the naval forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 30 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EFFECT OF OPA PRICE REGULATIONS ON SALES OF WASHING MACHINES

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the question of continuance of OPA and its regulations will come before the Senate shortly. I should like to read to the Senate two paragraphs from a letter which is typical of a number of letters I have received. The letter happens to be from a man for whose integrity I can vouch. I received it this morning. He wrote:

On December 26 I wrote you a letter reciting a few facts regarding the effect of Government regulations and particularly the OPA.

I may say, Mr. President, that the letter to which he refers dealt with his losses.

A few days ago, I received a telephone call from the National Association of Manufacturers asking if they could use this in their publicity and I consented. This morning I am in receipt of a telegram asking if I will testify at the congressional hearing on extension of price control beginning February 5. I have accepted conditionally.

I hear rumors that employers who publicize their troubles or criticisms of Government bureaucrats, suddenly find themselves facing intense investigations and there is a growing fear among employers to come out

and say what they think. In your opinion, should I testify or is there reason to be fearful of what they might do on investigations?

Your comments will be very much appreciated.

Mr. President, I have received another letter, together with a short statement of actual cost of washers, from a distributor of washing machines, who shows by his letter and by his break-down statement of costs that he is losing money on every washing machine he sells at the OPA ceiling prices at which he is permitted to sell them.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, together with the break-down of costs, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, without the necessity of reading them.

There being no objection, the letter and statement of costs were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1946.

HON. B. B. HICKENLOOPER,

Washington D. C.

DEAR SIR: As a distributor for * * * who manufacture * * * washers, we are enclosing certain pertinent information, substantiated with actual-cost figures as pertains to OPA's new pricing order RPO SO-119-60.

These figures are all substantiated with paid freight bills, which we have had to pay, covering the cost of one carload of washers which we have already received here * * *. The date of unloading was January 14, 1946.

It is needless to point out to you that if OPA's pricing policy continues with the same train of thoughts they have shown in the past, it will be a financial impossibility for a distributor to market washing machines under any circumstances. I realize there is a lot of inefficiency in the OPA executive offices in Washington, but I didn't realize that in the face of a so-called reconversion program, a pricing structure such as this would hold the line down.

I cannot imagine, in a country which is supposed to be full of free enterprise such as the United States of America, anyone establishing a price which would force the distributor completely out of business, if he were to attempt to meet the OPA price structure.

Unless some relief is granted by OPA in this pricing structure on * * * washing machines, it will be necessary for me to cancel my contract with * * * inasmuch as I will not operate at a loss, now or at any time in the future.

Trusting that you will do everything in your power to help alleviate this situation, which is constrictive to the distributors' business, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

Actual cost of washers by known cost factors

Cost of washer, f. o. b. factory.....	\$43.420
Cost of freight in carload lots	
(freight bill attached).....	1.483
Cost of unloading car (bill attached).....	.830
Warehousing if necessary.....	.470
Commission to salesman, 5 percent.....	2.440
Invoice and waybill form.....	.036
Cost of ledger entry.....	.164
Delivery of washer to dealer.....	1.250

Total cost of washer delivered to dealer.....	49.643
Allowable price to dealer under OPA revised pricing order No. SO-119-60.....	48.750

Net loss to distributor on each washer.....	.893
---	------

This is a true statement of costs on above washing machine.

HOUSING AND AMERICA'S FUTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Housing and America's Future," delivered by him over Station WIND and a group of Wisconsin stations, on February 2, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Foreign Policy, delivered by him before the National Citizens Political Action Committee, at the Hotel Commodore, New York, N. Y., January 31, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSALS FOR EXPANSION OF WORLD TRADE AND EMPLOYMENT

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from a document entitled "Proposals for Expansion of World Trade and Employment," developed by a technical staff of the United States Government in preparation for an international conference on trade and employment, which appear in the Appendix.]

PAULEY AND ALLEN—ARTICLE BY WALTER LIPPMANN

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Pauley and Allen," by Walter Lippmann, published in the Washington Post of February 5, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPEAL FROM DECISION OF THE CHAIR ON CLOTURE MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair, holding it was not in order on yesterday under the rules to present a cloture motion on Senate bill 101, the FEPC bill, stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. EASTLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me to make a point of no quorum?

Mr. EASTLAND. If I do not lose the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Myers
Austin	Hart	O'Daniel
Bailey	Hatch	Overton
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hickenlooper	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hill	Reed
Bilbo	Hoey	Revercomb
Brewster	Huffman	Robertson
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Bushfield	Kilgore	Shipstead
Butler	Knowland	Smith
Byrd	La Follette	Stanfill
Capehart	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lucas	Taft
Carville	McCarran	Taylor
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Cordon	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Donnell	McKellar	Tobey
Downey	McMahon	Tunnell
Eastland	Magnuson	Tydings
Ellender	Maybank	Walsh
Ferguson	Mead	Wheeler
Fulbright	Millikin	Wherry
George	Mitchell	White
Gerry	Moore	Wiley
Gossett	Morse	Willis
Green	Murdock	Wilson
Guffey	Murray	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business as a representative of the United States attending the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, now being held in London.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me in order that I may make a short speech, with the understanding that the Senator will not lose the floor thereby?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania to make a speech, with that understanding.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, on December 21, 1945, my distinguished colleague the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], announced on the Senate floor that soon after Congress reconvened he would make a motion to bring S. 101, the bill to establish a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, before the Senate for action.

I want to commend the Senator for so promptly carrying out that announcement and to say that this legislation will have my utmost support.

Mr. President, in my opinion, action on S. 101 is long overdue.

More than a year ago, during the Presidential campaign, responsible leaders in the Democratic Party promised enactment of this legislation.

In fact, the party's standard bearer, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, indicated to the country that the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission would be one of his objectives, if elected.

I hardly think our southern citizens were unaware of the Presidential candidate's position on FEPC.

There was in no part of our country the slightest doubt of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's attitude toward our minority groups.

It is one of the certainties that he will go down in history as their best-loved President since Lincoln.

Yet, he was elected, and the South voted solidly for President Roosevelt while they knew that his administration, according to his own words, would seek enactment of legislation to create a Permanent Fair Employment Practice

Commission, because—and I quote from the President's Chicago speech:

Our economic bill of rights, like the sacred Bill of Rights of our Constitution itself, must be applied to all our citizens, irrespective of race, creed, or color.

The President's running mate in that election, Senator Harry S. Truman, had long ago pledged himself to the enactment of a bill to create a permanent FEPC.

He reiterated that pledge during the campaign.

When the tragedy of President Roosevelt's untimely death overtook us, it was fortunate for our country that Vice President Truman's record in the Senate, and in the campaign, had revealed him as a protector of all our people, Protestant, Catholic, and Jew, colored and white.

That record was the reassuring symbol in a moment of vast uncertainty and distress.

Since that time President Truman's forthright declarations on behalf of a permanent FEPC have been unhesitating.

Only recently, in his message to the Nation, he said:

On several occasions I have also asked that the Congress outlaw by permanent statute un-American discrimination in employment. * * * Legislation making permanent the Fair Employment Practice Committee would carry out a fundamental American ideal. I am sure that the overwhelming mass of our citizens favor this legislation and want their congressmen to vote for it.

Mr. President, it is not my impression that pledges made to the American people are made to be broken.

As legislators, Members of the Senate have a distinct responsibility to act, if we are not to invite an unhealthy cynicism in our voting citizenry.

This responsibility is not limited to this side of the Senate Chamber, for the Republican Party, in its campaign platform, pledged support to the passage of a permanent FEPC.

Just as President Truman states that he is sure that the great majority of our citizens favor this legislation and want their congressman to vote for it, so am I equally certain that the great majority of the Members of Congress, House and Senate, favor this legislation and want to vote for it.

It is a discordant note in this great democracy that a small group of men, through the misuse of legislative privilege, can block the march of progress against the will of the people, and the will of the majority of the Members of our legislature.

What are the reasons that provoke an opposition to attempt to break party pledges, and to use extreme legislative tactics to defeat this legislation?

I submit that those which have been brought to my attention must be the result of an amazing misunderstanding of the bill.

The ancient spectre of social equality has been raised in the name of this bill.

S. 101 applies solely in the field of economic equality—the very cornerstone of our democracy—first laid in the Declaration of Independence.

A few days ago Walter Lippmann, one of our foremost news columnists and authors, reminded us:

What democracy demands is equal rights for all men because they are men and, at the same time, equal opportunity—so that what is best and exceptional in each man may come forth and flourish.

Faith in democracy is justified by this promise that it will release talents and gifts that would be suppressed in a society of caste, and therefore that it brings into the service of the Nation and of mankind men who have rich and varied and excellent abilities.

The essence of what this bill calls for is that a scientist shall not be relegated to the role of ditch digger only because his skin is black; that a skilled toolmaker shall not be cast as a porter because of a Mexican background; that any man or woman shall have the opportunity in life that his or her skills and abilities and experience warrant, rather than that it shall be predetermined by the accident of his or her birth, or perhaps his or her religious faith.

The alternatives to the objectives of this legislation are reminiscent of Hitlerian policies, which we have just finished spilling life blood to defeat.

Equality of economic opportunity is the sole objective of this bill, and the issue of social equality has been dragged in as a red herring to confuse the gullible.

Some have said that prejudice cannot be legislated out of existence, any more than the prohibition law could be successful in its enforcement.

May I say emphatically that this bill does not seek to legislate against prejudice, but rather against the effects of prejudice. We are not allowed to shoot our neighbor even though he has incurred our intense dislike. Should we then be allowed to cut off the opportunity for our neighbor to make a living consistent with his merit because we are prejudiced against him?

Some spokesmen would have us believe that if this bill were passed the majority groups in this country would then find themselves discriminated against in the employment field. Such a charge is almost too ridiculous to answer. The bill is a protection for all people, whether white or colored, Protestant or Catholic, Jew or gentile.

Some of the bill's attackers have been wringing their hands over the idea that should it pass, Protestant schools would be forced to employ Catholic teachers, and vice versa. This is a curious kind of misrepresentation, since the church organizations themselves have been among the chief supporters of the legislation. In point of fact, no educational or religious institutions are in any way affected by the proposed legislation.

The bill covers, outside the Government agencies and firms holding Government contracts, only those employers and unions in business affecting interstate commerce.

Moreover, a religious institution might well need employees with a thorough background in its particular religion in order to carry on its work effectively. Such a background would be, in such an instance, a qualification of employ-

ment. The bill removes discrimination in employment for qualified applicants. It in no way waives qualifications in employment.

Mr. President, I have heard it said that this bill, if enacted, would deprive veterans of rights provided under the GI bill of rights. That is a claim out of whole cloth.

In point of fact, unless this bill is passed, millions of our minority veterans now coming back from the battlefields will find barriers of prejudice standing between them and the rights provided them in veterans' legislation. What good is it to offer minority veterans vocational retraining opportunities if their opportunities in employment at skilled levels are nonexistent?

Mr. President, we owe a great debt of appreciation to the Negro veterans. The War Department points out that more than a half million Negro soldiers "helped make possible the victory and are now protecting the peace." During the closing months of the European war Negro and white American soldiers fought in mixed units and had their joint baptism of fire.

One final point: Certain members of the opposition have raised threatening objections to this bill. They say it will stimulate disruption and group hatreds. Actually, just the opposite is the case. This law is a necessary safety valve. People who cannot get jobs through no fault of their own grow hungry, restless, and angry, and it is in that situation that the greatest incentive to rioting lies. The passage of this legislation is the best guaranty for racial harmony, for it is the essence of economic justice.

In short, the permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission will have but one function—to eliminate unfair employment practices based on discrimination on grounds of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry, and, further, to make certain that women shall not be discriminated against. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is willing to add the word "sex" so that the bill will apply to both men and women. This has my hearty approval.

Management continues free to set its own hiring, training, and upgrading practices, to adjust its internal plant policy, and to discharge according to any standard it may adopt, so long as there is no arbitrary discrimination because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

In the same way, organized labor continues free to manage its internal affairs according to its own lights, except that it cannot deny any of the advantages or opportunities of union organization and collective bargaining to any person because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. President, the country awaits enactment of this crucial piece of legislation. It is on the President's "must" list. The legislative process should be permitted to take its course.

The Senate of the United States can do no more or no less than to consider and vote on this legislation, which has been out of committee and before it for the past 10 months.

Chaplain Roland Gittelsohn dedicated the Fifth Marine Cemetery at Iwo Jima last summer. He said on that occasion:

Somewhere in this plot of ground there may lie the man who could have discovered the cure for cancer. Under one of these Christian crosses, or beneath a Jewish Star of David, there may rest now a man who was destined to be a great prophet. * * * Now they lie here silently in this sacred soil, and we gather to consecrate this earth to their memory. * * * Here lie officers and men, Negroes and whites, rich men and poor. * * * Here are Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. * * * here no man prefers another because of his faith or despises him because of his color.

Here there are no quotas of how many from each group are admitted or allowed.

Theirs is the highest and purest democracy.

Any man among us, the living, who * * * lifts his hand in hate against a brother, or thinks himself superior to those who happen to be in the minority, makes of this ceremony and of the bloody sacrifice it commemorates an empty, hollow mockery.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the indulgence of the Senator from Mississippi to make a few remarks on the subject of the steel strike and steel financing, if I may do so with the understanding that the Senator will not lose the floor.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the subject which he has been discussing will he yield to me for a question in connection with his statement?

Mr. GUFFEY. Certainly.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has stated that the question of social equality was in no wise involved in Senate bill 101, and has implied that those of us who are opposing the measure are opposed to economic equality. Of course, that may be a debatable question. We deny it.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is aware of the fact that there has been in existence a Committee on Fair Employment Practice, appointed by the President under an Executive order. It has had powers only with respect to the departments of Government, and with respect to those who have entered into contracts with the Federal Government. In the Federal Government the Committee on Fair Employment Practice has not only brought pressure to bear for the employment of members of minority groups—and I may say that there is no question in my mind that the Federal Government has the right to establish any kind of agency to handle such employment—but it has also brought pressure to bear upon departments of Government to do away with separate rest-room facilities for the races in the departments of Government, and to abolish the separate dining rooms for the races in various departments of Government, forcing all employees of all races to use the same facilities. I should like to ask the Senator if he considers it an unfair employment practice merely to have one rest room bearing the sign "Colored women's rest room" and another room with the sign "White women's rest room"; also a room bearing the sign "White men's rest room" and another room with the sign "Colored men's

rest room." Does the Senator think that is an unfair employment practice? Does he think that an agency such as FEPC should have the power to discharge any division or bureau head for approving such practices?

Mr. GUFFEY. I do.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Pennsylvania thinks that is a discrimination in economic opportunity; does he, rather than an effort to enforce social equality?

Mr. GUFFEY. I do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Well, Mr. President, I think that states very well the basic difference here between those who oppose this bill and those who support it. It shows the difference and it dispels forever to any fair-minded man the idea that those of us who are opposing this bill are fighting equality of economic opportunity and it shows conclusively, to my mind and, I think, to any fair-minded man, that the object back of this bill is not so much equality of economic opportunity as it is to force social equality and intermingling of the races; and we can leave it to such a matter as the illustration which I have just presented to the Senator from Pennsylvania. That is the kind of so-called economic equality this agency will undertake to enforce.

I should like to ask the Senator further whether he would consider a plant which had separate rest-room facilities for the races—a plant which would be under the jurisdiction of this Commission—to be engaging in an unfair employment practice?

Mr. GUFFEY. Does the Senator mean a plant which had such facilities divided as to whites and Negroes?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. GUFFEY. I would.

I should like to say to the Senator from Georgia that about 40 years ago, when I was a young man, I was employed in the Pittsburgh post office, and I had under me about 400 people. I was employed there as superintendent of delivery. I broke up that practice. I believed in what I did then, and I believe in it now.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not criticizing the Senator for holding that view even though I differ with him. I do not think it has anything to do with economic equality.

Mr. GUFFEY. That is my position.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to make it clear that, according to my viewpoint, in those cases the question of economic equality is not involved. The Senator's position is perfectly clear; he is supporting this bill because he thinks there should be such a law, with a powerful agency to support it, with the power to declare that the case I have cited is unfair economic discrimination, and jail any employer who has separate facilities for the races. Of course, the Senator from Pennsylvania knows that one of the most celebrated cases which was tried by the so-called Fair Employment Practice Committee was in connection with a plant somewhere in Maryland where telephones were manufactured for the Army. The Fair Employment Practice Committee moved into the plant. It could not find that there was any difference in the

pay which was given the employees. All the employees, white or black, received equal pay for equal work. The Committee could not find that there was any discrimination in regard to the ranks or titles or positions of employees of the company. But it did find that the company maintained separate rest-room facilities. The company was ordered to tear down the partitions and to permit the races to intermingle in those facilities. That brought about a serious strike. But the Senator's viewpoint is that the Committee was correct in declaring it to be an unfair employment practice to have separate rest rooms; is that correct?

Mr. GUFFEY. I say it is discrimination.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the Senator from Pennsylvania says it is an unfair employment practice and one which should subject a man to the severe penalties and punishment under this bill. The Senator from Pennsylvania further knows that there was a case affecting a maritime union whose members were working upon Government contracts. The union had both white and black members. All of them met together in the same union hall. All of them had the same representatives in collective bargaining. But on the ships their men sailed the union did insist that there be separate sleeping quarters for the black sailors and separate sleeping quarters for the white sailors, and separate eating places for the white sailors and separate eating places for the black sailors. The Fair Employment Practice Committee ordered the union to stop that practice, although the members of the union apparently had been satisfied as long as the black sailors or Negro sailors received the same pay, exactly the same facilities, exactly the same food, exactly the same kind of bunks. The Negro sailors did not complain about it. But the Fair Employment Practice Committee said the union had to do away with that, that it was an unfair practice to have the men segregated. The Senator from Pennsylvania indicates that he agrees with that decision.

Mr. GUFFEY. I do.

Mr. RUSSELL. And, of course, the Senator from Pennsylvania then thinks that a private employer or a labor union should be subjected to the penalties prescribed in the bill if he or it made any division whatever between the different races of people employed by the plant or business, in facilities of this nature, even if they are identical in quality.

Mr. GUFFEY. I do.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for clarifying the issue.

THE PRESENT CRISIS IN THE BASIC STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I desire to bring to the attention of the Senate some significant facts concerning the present crisis in the basic steel industry.

The basic steel industry has total assets of approximately \$6,000,000,000. Its plants are scattered throughout the entire country. It employs approximately one-half million workers in its steel-making plants. Hundreds of thousands

more are engaged in the various fabricating branches of the steel industry.

In many cases, the steel plant represents the sole manufacturing concern in the community. The economic health of many an individual community depends upon the pay rolls of the steel plant in the vicinity.

Even this does not give us anything like a full picture of the power of the basic steel industry. Basic steel is our economic barometer. When the men in the steel industry are prosperous and are working full time, workers throughout the Nation fare likewise. When the basic steel industry grants a wage increase, other industries follow suit. Frequently the other industries merely rubber-stamp the wage increase in steel. When steel refuses to grant an increase, or when basic steel inaugurates a wage cut, the other industries do likewise. It is no wonder that everyone keeps a keen eye on trends in the steel industry. This is true in collective bargaining matters as well as in other phases of our economic activity.

From the standpoint of collective bargaining, there is within the basic steel industry one company which the industry considers the bellwether, the United States Steel Corp., so-called "big steel." Ever since its inception, this large corporation has been the industry arbiter on wage matters. In days before collective bargaining, United States Steel first determined whether there was to be a wage increase, a wage cut, or no change. When United States Steel acted, other steel companies acted in the same manner and to the same degree. Other industries then followed the trend in steel.

The importance of the United States Steel Corp. has not diminished in this era of collective bargaining. Negotiations between United States Steel and the United Steelworkers of America are the first to begin in basic steel. Most other companies ask to defer collective-bargaining decisions until the United States Steel negotiations reach a conclusion one way or the other. The results of these negotiations are embodied in contracts throughout the industry. In most cases, the other companies ask for, and receive, the identical provisions embodied in the United States Steel contracts, without so much as a change in the punctuation. In every case, the substantial provisions of the Carnegie-Illinois agreement are usually the basic structure of other steel contracts.

Today, the workers in United States Steel and every other basic steel company, with the notable exception of Henry J. Kaiser's plants on the west coast, are out on strike. So I should like to review the process that led to the taking of a drastic step by one of the most responsible labor unions in the country.

Since December 1943, the steelworkers have been trying to get a wage increase. Negotiations with the companies broke down then, and the case went to the National War Labor Board which, after a lengthy fact-finding process, declined to hand down any decision on wage policy, and sent its report to the President.

In August 1945, the President changed the national wage stabilization policy, returning wage negotiations to the arena of collective bargaining; and in September the War Labor Board ruled that the steel contracts could be reopened on the issue of wages.

In October, the United Steelworkers presented to the companies their request for a \$2-a-day wage increase. This \$2-a-day increase, if granted, would not have meant any more money in the workers' pay envelopes than they were getting at the peak of war production.

Here are the facts: The average weekly earnings of steel workers in April 1945 were \$56.32. They now stand at \$43.48—a drop of \$12.84. Even if the full \$2-a-day increase had been granted, the workers in the steel industry would still be earning \$2.84 less each week than during the last full month before VE-day.

The union spent 2 days outlining to the steel corporations its case for this wage increase. The United States Steel Corp. handed the union a letter refusing to make any counteroffer and rejecting the requested \$2-per-day increase.

In November, the Secretary of Labor invited union and corporation representatives to meet for conciliation. The union accepted, but the company rejected the invitation. A week later the invitation was repeated, and the same answer given—acceptance by the union, rejection by the corporation.

On November 28 the National Labor Relations Board conducted a strike vote among the workers in compliance with the provisions of the Smith-Connally Act.

The workers voted 5 to 1 for a strike, but the union still deferred taking such drastic action.

The union's wage policy committee, consisting of 131 workers elected by the membership and the union's directors and officers, met on December 10, and set the strike date for January 14, more than a month later.

It was not until the last week before the strike was scheduled to take place that United States Steel made a counterproposal of 15 cents an hour increase, and that only after there had been lengthy negotiations with the Government for an increase in the price of steel.

The results of these increased-price negotiations have never been officially announced.

The union lowered its request from 25 cents an hour to 19½ cents, that figure having been recommended by the fact-finding board in the General Motors strike.

After two sessions at the White House the company refused to grant an increase of more than 15 cents.

President Truman then suggested that the company and the union agree on an 18½ cents an hour increase. The union accepted. The company declined flatly and made no further offer. In effect, it preferred to battle to a finish, and thereby jeopardize not only the welfare of its own workers but that of the entire Nation.

The blame for the present strike in the steel industry rests squarely with the company because of its adamant position.

This does not seem to be merely a case of United States Steel setting a pattern and the rest of industry following suit, but rather a planned campaign on the part of the greatest and wealthiest corporations in America to hold up the American people for exorbitant price increases or to destroy organized labor.

The Government of this country is faced with a great responsibility in this hour, and I hope that the legislative branch of the Government will accept that responsibility.

I support wholeheartedly President Truman's recommendation of a wage increase for the steel workers. I have grave doubt that the passage of fact-finding legislation would have solved this strike problem.

The facts have been found. The workers have cooled off for far more than 30 days, without the compulsion of law. Yet, 1,500,000 workers are now on strike across the Nation because of the continued refusal of corporations to grant adequate wage increases.

The proper committees of the House and Senate should look into this apparently joint activity on the part of large corporations and the moneyed interests, and lay bare the facts, not as to industry's ability to pay higher wages—that has been demonstrated—but as to its program for America.

I also hope, Mr. President, that serious attention will be given to revising our tax laws so that the American people will not be subsidizing corporations in their efforts to break the organizations of their workers.

The present situation is particularly alarming when viewed against the backdrop of history.

I can only conclude from the attitude of the corporations that they are bent on getting as large profits as possible and paying as low wages as possible.

The past wage history in the steel industry shows that in 1923 the United States Steel Corp. raised wages about 10 percent. The rest of the industry followed suit. That wage increase was the last general raise granted in the 1920's.

Steel wages were frozen until 1931, when a cut of 11 percent took place, followed by another cut of 15 percent in 1932.

Steel profits during the years when wages were frozen soared from \$188,000,000 in 1924 to \$483,000,000 in 1929.

During those same years the industry reduced its funded debt by 38 percent and increased its net working capital by 17 percent. That is the picture of steel wages and profits during the twenties—and steel was setting the pattern then as now.

Wages in all industries stayed down, and profits rose, with the result which we all know. Our top-heavy economic structure collapsed in 1929.

There is one fundamental difference between the 1920's and the present time. The steel industry and other basic industries are now organized, and the

union in those industries, with the steel union in the lead, are waging a fight for higher wages which, if successful, will lessen the danger of another disastrous economic collapse and resulting depression.

The Government should not stand idly by and watch American industry, in its headlong drive for higher profits, destroy the people's bulwark against the threat of another depression.

For the benefit of any who may have doubts concerning the present ability of steel corporations to pay higher wages, I wish to include an analysis of the financial status of the steel industry.

During 1935-39, according to its own reports, the United States Steel Corp. averaged net profits annually, before taxes, of \$78,470,000. During the 1940-44 period, however, it averaged \$209,908,000 annually, an increase of 168 percent.

Of course, this is not complete. There were taxes to be paid. How about net profits after taxes? During 1935-39, net profits after taxes for United States Steel averaged \$36,015,000. During 1940-44, the average was \$82,726,000, an increase of 130 percent.

During 1935-39, the corporation's dividends averaged \$35,306,000. During 1940-44, they averaged \$60,033,000, an increase of 70 percent.

How did the corporation look at the end of the last fiscal year, after its war experiences? On January 1, 1940, the corporation had \$1,768,524,000 in total assets. On January 1, 1945, its total assets were \$2,082,374,000, or an increase of 18 percent.

How about the cash position of the corporation? The net current assets—the excess of current assets over current liabilities—went from \$431,988,000 on January 1, 1940, to \$773,814,000 on January 1, 1945, an increase of 79 percent.

The undistributed profits—after all taxes and dividends were paid—went from \$263,319,000 on January 1, 1940, to \$376,625,000 on January 1, 1945, an increase of more than \$100,000,000, or 43 percent.

The reserves of the corporation went from \$38,638,000 to \$206,916,000, an increase of 436 percent.

This is what happened to the corporation during the period about which it complains, the period for which Mr. Fairless wants a compensatory price increase of about \$7 a ton. Net profits before taxes rose 168 percent; net profits after taxes, 130 percent; dividends, 70 percent; total assets, 18 percent; net current assets, 79 percent; undistributed profits, 43 percent; and reserves, 436 percent.

Mr. Fairless claims the corporation suffered. The figures speak for themselves on this score.

But another representative of the same company took a different position recently. Mr. Enders M. Vorhees, of the finance committee of United States Steel, according to a trade paper, said, "The corporation was in the best financial position it ever had experienced."

I think these facts are quite illuminating and worth while in light of Mr. Fairless' actions.

There are a number of other steel corporations which have, in effect, taken the same position as United States Steel. They claim they need compensatory price relief.

Let us examine the records of these representative steel corporations. During 1935-39 Bethlehem averaged \$26,314,000 in profits before taxes. During 1940-44 it averaged \$143,557,000, an increase of 446 percent. Net profits after taxes went from an average of \$15,980,000 in 1935-39 to \$35,363,000 during 1940-44, an increase of 121 percent. Dividends went from \$11,358,000 to \$23,894,000 in these two periods, or an increase of 110 percent.

Bethlehem's total assets on January 1, 1940, were \$734,932,000. On January 1, 1945, they were \$1,055,214,000, an increase of 44 percent. Net current assets went from \$189,339,000 on January 1, 1940, to \$314,086,000 on January 1, 1945, an increase of 66 percent. Undistributed profits went from \$78,229,000 to \$133,343,000, an increase of 71 percent. Reserves rose from \$10,577,000 to \$55,771,000, or 427 percent.

These are not unusual cases in the industry. As a whole, the industry shows the same trend, according to an analysis which I have received.

Public reports for individual companies have been extended to give an approximation of the entire industry's status. The extension is based on relative capacity of the companies furnishing public reports and the industry as a whole. Based on this adjustment, how did the industry as a whole fare?

Net profits before taxes went from an annual average of \$186,511,000 during 1935-39 to \$700,401,000 during 1940-44, representing an industry-wide increase of 276 percent. Net profits after taxes increased 113 percent, from an annual average of more than \$115,000,000 to \$245,000,000.

Dividends paid by the industry rose from \$83,000,000 to \$152,984,000 annually, an increase of 82 percent.

The total assets of the industry went from \$4,863,693,000 on January 1, 1940, to \$5,914,467,000 on January 1, 1945, an increase of 22 percent. Net current assets jumped from \$1,210,878,000 to \$2,034,713,000, or 68 percent.

The industry's undistributed net profits on January 1, 1940, were \$585,468,000; on January 1, 1945, \$1,061,298,000. The increase is 81 percent. Reserves went from \$103,121,000 to \$394,956,000, a jump of 283 percent.

This industry then, through Mr. Fairless, said that although net profits before taxes rose 276 percent, although net profits after taxes rose 113 percent, although it paid 82 percent more in dividends, and although its assets increased by more than a billion dollars, it still wanted a price increase of \$7 a ton before it would even begin to bargain with the union.

This is the picture based upon an acceptance of the industry's own figures and industry's own interpretation of the figures. The picture and analysis is not an exaggeration.

On the contrary, the union claims that industry has understated its profits, and

so forth, through certain bookkeeping fictions. The union claims that the industry has mushroomed alleged depreciation, depletion, and amortization allowances, created new reserves, and increased pension funds in order to deflate the real profits.

The union says that the increases over peacetime practices in this respect are net profits camouflaged. They are actually net profits by another name.

In order that Senators may have an idea of what this means, I shall show the picture for United States Steel for 1944.

The corporation admitted its net profits after taxes for 1944 were about \$60,751,000—during 1936-39 they averaged \$44,732,000. But in addition to these profits, the corporation increased its normal contribution to the pension reserves by more than \$25,000,000. It created special reserves amounting to \$25,000,000.

These are not operating costs—they are not deductions from income under our tax laws. If we add these figures to admitted profits, we find that the net profits at this point were, in round figures, in excess of \$110,000,000 instead of some sixty million as reported.

Nor is this all. According to the union, there are other similar practices.

If we continue this adjustment all along the line, we find that the corporation's net profits for 1944 were \$160,091,000 as contrasted with the prewar average of \$44,732,000.

As for the industry as a whole, the reported net profits after taxes were about \$190,366,000. This is about \$75,000,000 more than the peacetime average.

If we add the excess in reserves and allowances to determine the true income—as the Government would do in determining taxes—we find that the full profits after taxes amounted to \$407,531,000 for 1944, or almost four times the peacetime average.

The union told me it would be willing to have any Government income and tax expert check the validity of its conclusion that the industry's true profits after taxes last year were \$407,531,000, instead of the \$190,366,000 carried by industry under its public reports of its net profit account.

So much for the past. These figures should suffice in enabling one to judge how the corporation and the industry did during the past few years. But the corporation wants assurances of possible future price increases. It is dissatisfied with the future prospects. One might also well examine this claim.

We are not in possession of the full picture for 1945. We must use preliminary figures, and make estimates of what is ahead of the industry. The most nearly complete figures are for the first 6 months of 1945. What happened, compared to a similar period in 1944? For the first 6 months of 1945, United States Steel reported net profits of \$32,153,000. For the first 6 months of 1944 it made \$32,383,000. It was standing still, not retreating appreciably. But every other major steel company for the same period showed its net profits were higher in 1945 than in 1944. Bethlehem's rose 20 percent; Republic Steel's, 49 percent;

Jones & Laughlin's, 22 percent; and so forth. There is every indication that steel profits for 1945 will follow the national corporate income trend.

According to the United States Department of Commerce, 1945 corporate profits will be \$9,300,000,000, compared with \$9,900,000,000 for 1944, and compared with \$8,700,000,000 average for the war years, or \$3,300,000,000 for the 1936-39 peacetime average.

Mr. President, what will be the impact of the proposed increase of \$2 a day on the industry's future income? This is the corporation's second reason for refusing to bargain. Unfortunately, the corporation has not issued any figures concerning this point. We must turn to other sources. The union has prepared an analysis of the prospects. The increase, if granted, would amount to the gross figure of \$250,000,000 a year.

How will this affect the industry's costs and profits? As to increasing the costs over past figures, we must remember that the industry is returning to a 40-hour week as a result of VJ-day. This will reduce overtime costs. It will also reduce vacation-pay costs, since vacation pay is based on the workweek. Based on pay-roll figures published by the American Iron & Steel Institute, these two items will reduce pay rolls about 10.6 cents an hour. This amounts to an annual pay-roll reduction of \$126,818,000.

It is, therefore, obvious that the increases in costs will be the difference between the demand and these pay-roll savings. Thus, if the increase is granted, pay rolls will increase over 1944 levels by less than \$125,000,000, in round figures.

This does not include additional pay-roll savings through downgradings, demotions, elimination of newer and less efficient workers, increased productive efficiency, and so forth.

Moreover, according to the union, under the repeal of excess-profits-tax laws, the corporation will save some \$123,404,000. Thus, pay-roll costs will decline \$125,000,000 and taxes will drop about \$125,000,000.

The gross wage demand is \$250,000,000. On this basis, costs would be \$100,000,000 less annually even if the full increase were granted.

On the basis of these developments in pay rolls and taxes, plus industry's estimates of production for next year, the union concludes that industry's net profits after taxes for next year will be \$482,880,000 even if the wage increase were granted in full. This would be more than four times the peacetime average, 1936-39.

These estimates have been submitted publicly by the union. So far as I can tell, the industry has not denied the truth of this analysis and prediction.

STARVATION AND THE FOOD PROBLEM IN EUROPE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement which I have prepared on conditions in Europe

as they relate to starvation and the food problem.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the alleged "peacetime" policies of this administration have degenerated into a deliberate face-saving fraud. The fact can no longer be suppressed, namely, the fact that it has been, and continues to be, the deliberate policy of a confidential and conspiratorial clique within the policy-making circles of this Government to draw and quarter a nation now reduced to abject misery.

In this process this clique, like a pack of hyenas struggling over the bloody entrails of a corpse, and inspired by a sadistic and fanatical hatred, are determined to destroy the German nation and the German people, no matter what the consequences.

Mr. President, this is no thoughtless or unsubstantiated charge that I am making. I speak from a deep and studied conviction. It now appears, from the facts that are already available to the whole world, that we have fought the most diabolic war in history at the cost of unmeasured sacrifice only to find that our greatest enemy and the gravest threats to the honor, the integrity, and the continued existence of our free institutions, have moved right into our own midst.

I heartily welcome any proof to the contrary, from my colleagues on the Senate floor or from the American people.

In August 1940, Prime Minister Churchill made the following solemn promise:

"We can and will arrange in advance for the speedy entry of food into any part of the enslaved area . . . so that there will always be held up before the eyes of the people of Europe including—I say it deliberately—the German and Austrian peoples the certainty that the shattering of the Nazi power will bring to them all immediate food, freedom, and peace."

On October 27, 1945, in the Nation, Mr. Leon Henderson quoted from a letter written by President Roosevelt to Secretary of War, Stimson:

"It is of utmost importance that every person in Germany should realize that this time Germany is a defeated nation. I do not want them to starve to death, but, as an example, if they need food to keep body and soul beyond what they have, they should be fed three times a day with soup from Army soup kitchens. That will keep them perfectly healthy, and they will remember that experience all their lives."

And on September 17, President Truman himself issued the following statement:

"This Government has abundant evidence that the American people are aware of the suffering among our allies. They have also made plain their determination that this country shall do its full part along with other supplying nations in helping to restore health and strength to those who fought at our side, both in Europe and the Far East. It is an American responsibility not only to our friends but to ourselves to see that the job is done and done quickly."

At Potsdam the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics solemnly signed the following declaration of principle and purpose:

"It is not the intention of the Allies to destroy or to enslave the German people."

Mr. President, the cynical and savage repudiation of these solemn declarations, which has resulted in a major catastrophe, cannot be explained in terms of ignorance or incompetence. This repudiation, not only of the Potsdam declaration, but also of every law of God and man, has been deliberately engineered with such a malevolent cunning, and with such diabolic skill, that the Amer-

ican people, themselves, have been caught in an international death trap.

A few days after Pastor Niemöller was liberated by the Allied forces he was guest at a dinner given by General Alexander. By some mischance certain members of this conspiratorial clique to which I have referred discovered that Pastor Niemöller, realizing the extent of the tragedy that was already developing—not only in Germany and Austria, but throughout Europe—had announced his intention of going to Switzerland and then to America to appeal to his fellow Christians and men of good will of every faith all over the world for immediate action to avert this impending tragedy.

The moment this fact became known Pastor Niemöller was arrested, and on the very next day following his dinner with General Alexander was returned to a concentration camp. His spirit, still unbroken by this unheard-of cruelty inflicted on him, moved him to go on a hunger strike. In order to escape a scandal this same clique had him removed from the concentration camp but took every other possible means of strangling any word from his mouth that might reach America.

Mr. President, on January 29 my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], brought the facts of what had ensued since that time before the attention of the Senate in one of the most courageous and scathing indictments ever charged against any administration. In the course of his speech many of his colleagues from both sides of the aisle rose in his support. My colleague charged that the American people had been made the unwilling accomplices in the crime of mass starvation, and he laid the responsibility for that crime right where it belongs—squarely on the shoulders of this administration.

If there is not a deliberate conspiracy of strangulation, suppression, and silence operating right here at home as well as abroad, how is it that when 15 or more Members of the United States Senate make such a serious charge against the administration, and when there was not a single man who raised his voice in defense even of the President, both the radio and the press, with one or two exceptions, joined in this conspiracy of silence by refusing to tell the American people what went on in the United States Senate?

Mr. President, this strangulation and perversion of the truth makes it impossible for many of the American people to understand just exactly what is at stake now in America's policies toward her former enemies. Yet I am amazed that there are not more who do not understand the issues involved.

The first issue is purely humanitarian. Germany has become largely a nation of the aged and of women and children. Yet the policies we have been pursuing have degenerated into the calloused and inhuman practices of the Nazis themselves. For 9 months now this administration has been carrying on a deliberate policy of mass starvation without any distinction between the innocent and the helpless and the guilty alike.

On February 2 Lt. Gen. Lucius Clay declared categorically:

"There is no starvation in the United States zone of Germany nor is it intended that there shall be."

According to the Associated Press dispatch of that date, General Clay said:

"Five teams of American nutrition experts were constantly scrutinizing nutrition of the German people in the American zone and had found no cases of starvation."

Mr. President, without exception the authority in the field of nutrition are agreed that the official United States Government policy of 1,550 calories a day is a starvation diet.

Secretary Byrnes himself has admitted that this diet cannot sustain life over a long period of time.

Byron Price warned President Truman on November 28 last:

"The United States must ship food enough to Germany to increase the basic ration to 2,000 calories, if starvation, epidemics, and disorder under a new 'leader' are not to spread through Germany and all western Europe."

Mr. President, not long ago the University of Minnesota Medical School conducted an experiment on the effect of a 1,500-calory diet on 34 human guinea pigs, volunteers who were carefully picked for physical and psychological normality from among conscientious objectors. For 6 months they were fed at the semistarvation level, going down to about 1,500 calories per day, to which millions of Europeans are subjected. Not only did the effects of this experiment make it difficult for these men to maintain their dispositions, their judgment, their intellectual work, and any form of manual labor, but the really striking thing was that the men made almost no improvement at all when their diet was raised to a level of 2,000 to 2,500 calories. It was only after a very considerable time, under a 4,000-calory diet, that real progress was made. The *Worldover Press*, in commenting on this experiment, observed:

"The significance of this for the rehabilitation of Europe and for the hope of democracy in Europe is obvious and appalling."

On February 1, the day before General Clay stated categorically that there is no starvation in the American zone, the *New York Times* carried a special dispatch from Frankfurt which states:

"In contrast to Senator KENNETH WHERRY's protests against starvation levels which he indicated he believed were being maintained in the United States zone, the Food and Agriculture Division reported that the amount of rationed food permitted had increased consistently in each succeeding ration period and that the normal consumer received 1,262 calories daily in the eighty-first period, ended November 11."

"The daily ration rose to 1,550 the first week in January, and recommendations are now pending that it be increased to 1,750. The public-health officers of the military government, who submitted this proposal, further indicated that if the average weights of civilians dropped it would be further increased to a minimum of 2,000 calories daily. The increase in the ration, however, caused an unduly rapid reduction of the indigenous resources and a corresponding increase in import requirements, the report added."

Mr. President, what kind of reporting is this? Is not this more of the same misinformation and misinterpretation that has helped to bring this tragedy on our heads. These facts reported by the *New York Times* do not contradict the junior Senator from Nebraska's statement that we are parties to the crime of mass starvation; they confirm it. Is there anyone in this Senate body who will deny that a daily diet of 1,262 calories is a starvation diet? Is there anyone who would deny that if, at the end of a 6-month experiment with a starvation diet of 1,500 calories, it took a sustained diet of 4,000 calories to recover from those effects, that this statement in the *New York Times* makes General Clay's assertion that there is no starvation in Germany ridiculous. Up until November the Germans lived on a diet of 1,262 calories or less.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand authentic photographs of the condition in which German children were found as a result of this enforced starvation policy of this Government. I deeply regret the fact that there are not enough copies to be placed on the Senators' desks, but I invite their attention to the

condition described in these photographs and to the fact that they were published by Victor Gollancz, a Polish Jew, now one of the leading editors in England. Copies of this pamphlet can be obtained at 14 Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London, W. C. 2.

Sometime ago David Lawrence, the eminent editor and publisher of the *United States News*, predicted that as a result of our policies the American people would soon see pictures of conditions in the American zone in Germany that would rival in their horror the atrocity films that have already been displayed across the country. But Mr. Lawrence made this assertion upon the following condition: That the American news reporters were permitted to do their duty. Why is it, Mr. President, that if the American people want to see the results of their own policies in the American zone of occupation in Germany they must send to England for the films?

On February 3, Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson, in a radio broadcast sponsored by the State Department, acknowledged there will be starvation in Europe this winter despite all our efforts to prevent it. Mr. Acheson went on to say:

"We've won the war and we can't afford to let hunger and starvation defeat us now—even if it means a return to wartime conditions in some sectors of our economy."

Mr. Acheson continued:

"The short-supply countries between now and July 1 will need 17,000,000 tons of wheat, and that, at most, 12,000,000 tons can be shipped to Europe from the United States, Canada, Australia, and the Argentine, of which 6,000,000 must come from the United States. The situation is so bad in some countries that there is only enough wheat and flour for a 2 weeks' supply of bread. We cannot go on feeding wheat to our hogs and cattle while people die of hunger."

In the same broadcast, Under Secretary of Agriculture John B. Hutton warned this country:

"Unless we can greatly increase our foreign shipments of wheat, we may have to choose between these alternatives: Trying to limit the starvation to Germany, thereby running the danger of imperiling our whole occupation program or spreading the supply thinly everywhere, with the result that there will be starvation on a smaller scale throughout Europe, even in the countries of our allies."

In other words, Mr. President, the native humanitarianism of the United States and the instinctive love of decency and respect for human dignity have been taken advantage of by this conspiratorial clique within this administration which has kept the terrifying facts suppressed whenever any of the ugly consequences of their policies threatened to be opposed. The truth is that this tragedy has been so long in the making now that the American people are presented with two alternatives: Either we must continue the deliberate policy of starvation in Germany and Austria in order to keep the other liberated peoples alive, or we must spread our resources so thin that mass starvation will stalk the whole European Continent. At least these are the alternatives now presented to us by the official spokesmen for the administration. Mr. Acheson now admits there will be starvation in Europe this winter "despite all our efforts to prevent it."

Mr. President, in the face of these facts, are we to believe General Clay's assertion there is no starvation in the American zone in Germany and that the five nutrition boards operating in that zone cannot find a single case of starvation? Whom are we to believe? Mr. Acheson? Mr. Hutton? General Clay? Or these pictures that I hold in my hand?

One high-ranking Army officer returning from many months in the American zone in Germany, recently told of listening to the

death notices being read during the service in one of the largest German churches in Berlin. He said, as the list lengthened, he hung his head in shame while admitting to himself, "this is starvation."

Following is the story told by Dr. Lawrence Meyer on January 13 in St. Louis, Mo., after returning from an investigation of conditions in the American zone:

"The 1,300 to 1,700 calories allotted to people in Germany is barely enough to keep them alive if they stay in bed all day."

Dr. Meyer went on to say:

"Germany literally swarms with children. Eight children per family is nothing extraordinary. Millions of these children must die because there is not enough food. In Frankfurt at a children's hospital there have been set aside 25 out of 100 children. These will be fed and kept alive. It is better to feed 25 enough to keep them alive and let 75 starve now than to feed the 100 for a short while and let them all starve."

Dr. Meyer continued:

"On the way to Berlin we saw a caravan of 55 busses carrying 1,800 children. They were one section of a group of 50,000 being evacuated from Berlin for the winter to keep them alive. Bishop Dibelius of Berlin said that all children under 2½ years in that area will die this winter."

Whom are we to believe, Mr. President? At this very moment a conference is being prepared for the Cabinet members, to be held in the White House, to discuss a grain shortage so grave that some officials are talking of a return to rationing. On February 1, Secretary Anderson of the Department of Agriculture called this conference because Secretary Byrnes upon returning from Europe reported that failure of this country to meet its export quota would condemn millions to die of hunger before the winter ended. What are the American people to believe? It was only a few weeks before that Secretary of Agriculture Anderson stated that the vicious New Deal practices of plowing under crops and reducing acreage would have to be revived; that quotas for 1946 crops would have to be reduced, in order to maintain price levels in this country. And now, out of a clear sky, the American people are told that the maximum production of food of which this Nation is capable is not sufficient to prevent mass starvation among our allies and peoples of the conquered countries alike.

Mr. President, this is deliberate deceptive confusion. This is a conspiracy against the basic humanitarian instincts of the American people. These things do not just happen. They have been planned and engineered by this vicious conspiratorial clique to which I have referred that has already betrayed the American people.

I do not believe what General Clay says about no starvation in the American zone. And while he was careful to point out that he was speaking only for the American zone, there are three other zones in Germany, right in the heart of Europe, for the welfare, protection, and livelihood of which the American people were solemnly committed at Potsdam. There is no need to go through a long rehearsal of conditions in those zones for which we are responsible.

Mr. President, on September 21 the Catholic and Protestant clergy of Loerach sent a petition to the French military government which has just come into my hands, and from which I quote:

"In the name of Christianity, in the name of humanity, in the name of the peace aims for which the victorious powers went to war, conscious of their responsibility before God and before their people for the peace, the signatories refer, at this moment of greatest misery and most important decisions to the fateful consequences which the continuation of present methods of occupation, of starvation, the toleration of looting, the requisitioning of foodstuffs, will have for our people and for France."

"Fully conscious of the situation and of the tone of the population the ministers of Loerach urgently beg the French occupational authorities for moderation, for clemency, for aid; they beg for bread and peace for the starving population."

On October 12, the United States Army officials stopped turning over German prisoners to the French after the International Red Cross charged the French with failing to provide sufficient food for German prisoners working for them. The Red Cross made representations to the United States Army Headquarters that widespread malnutrition existed among German prisoners in French camps. The newspaper, *Figaro*, on September 22, quoted Gen. Louis Buisson, Director of the War Prisons, as admitting that food rations were "just enough to allow a man to lie down, not move, and not die too quickly."

The French Government has been compelled to reduce the bread ration in France for its own people. And now, at this very moment, the French Government is in Washington pleading with this administration to ship enough extra food into the French zone of occupation to prevent a catastrophic collapse, admitting that the French authorities have not been able to maintain a ration of 1,100 calories in the French zone since they took over its administration.

Mr. President, what are the facts in the Russian zone? I quote from a confidential memorandum prepared on October 12, 1945, by an outstanding European economist:

"Since the end of the war about 3,000,000 people, mostly women, children, and over-aged men, have been killed in eastern Germany and southeastern Europe; about 15,000,000 people have been deported or had to flee from their own homesteads and are on the road. About 25 percent of these people, over 3,000,000, have perished. About 4,000,000 men and women have been deported to eastern Europe and Russia as slaves."

"A distorted picture of the relief needs has been given. The major problem is the political arrangements which prevent the people from organizing self-aid measures with the means still at their disposal. In Berlin, for instance, 3,000,000 people are starving while crops are rotting in surrounding agricultural areas. It seems that the elimination of the German population of eastern Europe—at least 15,000,000 people—was planned in accordance with decisions made at Yalta. Churchill had said to Mikolajczyk when the latter protested during the negotiations at Moscow against forcing Poland to incorporate eastern Germany: 'Don't mind the five or more million Germans. Stalin will see to them. You will have no trouble with them; they will cease to exist.' (Quoted in the conservative London news letter, *Review of World Affairs*.)"

Again, Dr. Lawrence Meyer on January 13 stated:

"About 16,000,000 German refugees east of the Oder are being deported from their homes. It has been estimated that already 10,000,000 have been driven out. The human tragedy and suffering caused by this forced 'Volkswanderung' are unparalleled in history. Hunger, cold, sickness, and death is the lot of millions. An authentic eyewitness report of the physical wretchedness of most of these refugees is pictured in the following:

"A large barge is slowly being towed across the Oder River. In it, lying on straw, are 300 children ranging from 2 to 14 years of age. There is hardly a sign of life in the whole group. Their hollow eyes, their swollen bellies, knees, and feet are telltale signs of starvation. These are merely the vanguard of hundreds of thousands—millions of homeless, tattered, hungry, sick, helpless, hopeless human beings fleeing westward—west of the Oder and the Neisse Rivers."

"A trust in God—in His goodness and mercy—these are the only hope of Germany today. And thank God in many there is still faith in God against which the gates of hell have stormed in vain during the past decade."

Mr. President, I feel it my duty to read into the record from a report made by the German Central Administration for Health at the beginning of this winter regarding conditions in the Russian zone. The agency reporting is a German agency set up by Moscow. In speaking of the population in the Russian zone of Germany these authorities state:

"The people hunger. They hold only the immediate present responsible for their condition. They are without the energy to trace the links of causes. They have even forgotten Hitler. Beyond the immediate present their power to reproduce even memory does not reach. There is growing, as though by psychological compulsion, a mass hysteria, with a thousand different symptoms of drug addiction, drunkenness, perversities, sadism, murder, infantilism, the situation is reaching a generally psychopathological state, through chronic hunger. We are seeing aberrations such as were previously known only among stranded and starving sailors in lifeboats, or thirsting persons forgotten by caravans in desert sands. It is increasingly impossible to discover in the masses of the people opinions. They have only animal urges."

"The explanation of this mass phenomenon, this mental and spiritual paralysis, is physical. They are emaciated to the bone. Their clothes hang loose on their bodies, the lower extremities are like the bones of a skeleton, their hands shake as though with the palsy, the muscles of the arms are withered, the skin lies in folds, and is without elasticity, the joints spring out as though broken."

"The weight of the women of average height and build has fallen away below 110 pounds. Often women of child-bearing age weigh no more than 65 pounds. The number of still-born children is approaching the number of those born alive, and an increasing proportion of these die in a few days. Even if they come into the world of normal weight, they start immediately to lose weight and die shortly. Very often the mothers cannot stand the loss of blood in childbirth, and perish. Infant mortality has reached the horrifying height of 90 percent."

On December 8, Bertrand Russell, writing in the *New Leader*, states:

"The Russian zone was the chief food-producing area of Germany, and the western powers had supposed that there would still be an exchange of food from the eastern regions for industrial products from the west. The Russians, however, seized almost all livestock and stores of food and agricultural machinery, and transported all able-bodied men to forced labor in Russia or Poland. There is consequently not nearly enough food left in eastern Germany to feed even the normal population. What food there is goes largely to the Russian troops, which are not fed from home as are the British or Americans."

"Meanwhile Russia has annexed East Prussia, and Poland has annexed the rest of what was Germany east of the Oder and the Neisse. All Germans in these regions and the Sudeten 'Germans,' who are in fact Austrians, have been or are being expelled into Austria or the Russian zone of what remains Germany. It was agreed at Potsdam that these expulsions should take place 'in a humane and orderly manner,' but this provision has been flouted. At a moment's notice, women and children are herded into trains, with only one suitcase each, and they are usually robbed on the way of its contents. The journey to Berlin takes many days, during which no food is provided. Many are dead when they reach Berlin; children who

die on the way are thrown out of the window. A member of the Friends' Ambulance Unit describes the Berlin station at which these trains arrive as 'Belsen over again—carts taking the dead from the platform, etc.' A large proportion of those ejected from their homes are not put into trains, but are left to make their way westward on foot. Exact statistics of the numbers thus expelled are not available, since only the Russians could provide them. Ernest Bevin's estimate is 9,000,000. According to a British officer now in Berlin, populations are dying, and Berlin hospitals 'make the sights of the concentration camps appear normal.'

"Most of these refugees make their way first to Berlin. But in Berlin 80 percent of the houses have been destroyed, and of those that are intact a large proportion have been requisitioned by the Allies. In the available houses there is practically no furniture, as a result of Russian looting, while the Russians were in sole occupation. There is no coal for civilians and very little food; the best ration (to which few are entitled) is 1,200 calories, which is less than half the number considered adequate for a sedentary office worker normally clothed and housed, but in practice the nominal rations are not met, and refugees are not entitled to any rations at all while they stay in Berlin. It is expected that all children under 1 year old will die in Berlin before the end of the winter. During the three summer months the death rate for children under 1 year was already 594 per thousand; the general death rate for Berlin is at present 61 per thousand; it is expected to rise to about 200 during the winter.

"If millions of children are caused to die of hunger and disease bred of destitution through the action of our allies and many yet unborn are to be endowed by their fathers with the legacies of venereal infection or hunger, or both, we have our share of responsibility unless we do everything in our power to alter their policy or, if that is impossible, to mitigate its effects by unilateral action."

Mr. President, I am convinced that the American press has deliberately avoided the implications of the mass exodus of Jews from eastern and central European countries now under Russian domination which brought about the vicious charges against Gen. Sir Frederick Morgan, chief of UNRRA operations in Germany. The truth is, that this basic issue of humanitarianism of which I am speaking has been so violently degraded into a savage and inhuman attack on the body, the mind, the heart, and the spirit of man, that every race and every national and religious group caught in this barbarism are brutalized alike.

Mr. Michael G. Tress, president of the Agudath Israel Youth Council of America, returning from Europe after a month and a half abroad under UNRRA auspices, made just such a sorry admission when on January 23 he stated that the Jews, while they might in time make a way of life in Rumania, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, * * * fear the Russian orbit terribly.

Mr. President, it is generally accepted that the conditions in the British zone of occupation are best of all.

There is no need to go into a detailed discussion of conditions there. The British are terribly fearful of the impending catastrophe that threatens the whole of Europe. And they are doing everything within their power to alleviate the tragic conditions existing in their own zone.

The first issue has been, and continues to be, purely humanitarian, and this vicious clique within this administration that has been responsible for the policies and practices which have made a madhouse of central Europe has not only betrayed our American principles but they have betrayed the GI's

who have suffered and died, and they continue to betray the American GI's who have to continue to do their dirty work for them. As one high-ranking military official recently wrote from Berlin, "starvation of the wards of an occupation army corrupts that army to the bone."

I refuse to believe there is anything remotely American in this whole despicable deal. I agree with Dorothy Thompson who, on November 8, stated:

"The noisy articulate minority of revengers do not represent American opinion. The Christian church and communities from Quakers to Catholics are in protest. We shall soon, I predict, hear vehement reactions from labor circles against the advice on German trade unions being handed to General McNarney by American labor politicians who speak for no real percentage of American labor. The armed forces, quite outside, are furious over what the politicians are doing with the democratic victory. Foreign and domestic policy cannot be divided as though on two planets."

Mr. President, on December 1 the American Friends' Service Committee placed a large advertisement in five of the largest newspapers in the United States, pleading for a change in American policy under the headline "If Thine Enemy Hunger, Feed Him." I want to enter into the record a few of the 25,000 letters of support that have come from Jew and gentile, civilian and serviceman alike.

One man wrote from New York:

"The Nazi monsters have almost exterminated my people, not only in Germany but throughout Europe. Their anti-Semitic propaganda has had its repercussions throughout the world. Nevertheless, I still believe in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. I still believe that the German children should not suffer for the sins of their misguided fathers. I believe with all my heart that we should rise above the hatreds and prejudices engendered by the war and succor all people, including the Germans, who are afflicted and heavy laden."

Another refugee wrote:

"I have lost my old parents, my sister, my brother-in-law and a little nephew in German extermination camps. There are no excuses for German crimes and criminals and there are no excuses for statesmen who would permit a nation, any nation, men, women, and children, to become one vast extermination camp."

One veteran wrote:

"As an ex-GI of the Third Army, there are tens of thousands of guys like me who remember the not very pretty pictures of little kids—and grown-ups—fighting for the scraps from our mess kits as we ran a kind of gauntlet to get to the garbage cans after chow. I think it safe to say that we were the ones who sacrificed most because of the war; yet the 'let them starve' attitude seems to be more prevalent among the people here who saw the war through the news reels and enjoyed a higher standard of living than they ever had before."

And here is another GI, now in Detroit:

"I am a former serviceman returned to the United States November 2, 1945, after 17 months overseas. First, I fought the German Army. Then I lived with the German people. Circumstances beyond our control made us enemies, but I can find no room for hatred. * * * I fear that we as a nation are heedless of a very real opportunity of making the German Nation friendly to us which could be done simply by putting into practice some of that spirit of Christianity of which we boast so much and have so little."

Another soldier writes:

"I've just been discharged after 5 years in the United States Army. * * * After all, the war is over and if we want to teach

democracy to Europe, I think it's about high time the State Department wakes up."

A lieutenant commander in the Navy wrote this:

"I wish I could tell you how heartening it is to one who has just returned from overseas to hear, rising above the voices of bitterness, hatred, and confusion, the clear call of Christian brotherhood pointing to our duty. * * * Whether we like the German and Japanese people is beside the point. We cannot deny that we have chosen to make them our wards; we have therefore assumed entire responsibility for their existence, just as society assumes such a responsibility when it incarcerates a criminal. If people die of privation in the defeated countries this winter, their deaths will mark an atrocity on our part as deliberate and as horrible as those in the concentration camps of the Nazis and the Japs."

A marine says:

"I was recently discharged from the Marine Corps, after 5 years of service, and I certainly did not give 5 years of my life so that I could live in comparative luxury while others must suffer hunger and want."

On January 10, President Harry Truman received a passionate plea from Mr. Howard A. Smith of Connecticut, a plea which I believe represents the heart and conscience of America in this matter. Mr. Smith, by writing this letter, had merely joined the ever-lengthening line of American citizens and leaders who have been beating a path to the President's door pleading for a humanity that can no longer plead for itself. Mr. Smith concluded his letter with the following plea:

"Do not tell me you cannot do anything about it because of lack of ships. There are 121 ships tied up, the papers tell us, for lack of crews but we got crews during the war. We got crews by paying them a bonus for crossing the ocean, more bonuses for calling at certain ports, and more bonuses for going through mine areas. Well, there are no mine areas today and there are no submarines and there are no bombers to contend with, but there are reliable reports made by your representatives and officials that 10,000,000 women and children will die in Germany this winter. Already it is reported that few children are alive in Germany today who were born in 1945. The infant mortality rate is close to 100 percent.

"If we can pay bonuses to ship munitions to kill people, we can pay bonuses to ship food to save starving children. I am not a Nazi. I fought the Germans in 1917 and 1918 and my two boys fought them this time, but babies and women are not our enemies. For Jesus Christ's sake give them at least an equal chance with the other women and children in Europe. Please—before it is too late."

The second issue that is involved is the effect this tragedy in Germany has already had on the other European countries. Those who have been responsible for this deliberate destruction of the German state and this criminal mass starvation of the German people have been so zealous in their hatred that all other interests and concerns have been subordinated to this one diabolic obsession of revenge. In order to accomplish this end it mattered not if the liberated countries in Europe suffered and starved. To this point this clique of conspirators have addressed themselves: "Germany is to be destroyed. What happens to the other countries of Europe in the process is of secondary importance."

But, Mr. President, what has happened to these other countries? This group has subjected them to the status of corridors for their corroding hate. Burning with an all-consuming determination to wreak their vengeance while they could, this vicious minority have permitted Europe to be divided into two

hostile camps. Politically this group has nurtured the division between Fascists and anti-Fascist groups in every country in Europe. It is not only within Germany that the American technique of purging which has been carried on under the innocuous slogan of "de-Nazification," has earned for Mr. Morgenthau, Mr. Bernard Bernstein, the titles of "American Himmlers." This group has deliberately fostered such a rabid and rabble-rousing campaign of hatred that even in the liberated countries only those who demand the destruction of the German nation and the impoverishment and enslavement of the German people are to be tolerated.

In other words, in order to cover their bloody tracks and to gain the time necessary to complete their mission of destruction, this same clique has sabotaged, obstructed, misrepresented, and misinterpreted any American policy or American direction for the treatment of Germany worthy of the name. At this very moment Europe sits on a powder keg of political and ideological conflicts, suspicions, and hatreds.

It is an obvious fact that Europe cannot be cut up into little categories of classes or cliques or nationalities. Furthermore, it is obvious that even these categories which are being carved out of Europe cannot possibly restore any industrial, or economic, or social stability until political stability has been reestablished. Yet every government in Europe is tottering because this inner clique within this administration—and its now unofficial advisers—have merely whipped the basic ideological conflicts in the continent of Europe into a frenzied uncertainty and confusion to further their own aims, while at the same time millions of our allies and members of the United Nations were forced into more desperate and more ghastly circumstances.

Mr. President, this revenge that has motivated and directed the undermining of American principles has not stopped at undermining the future and security of Europe and Asia. From every section of the globe there now comes to America the tragic pleas of a starving world, pleas which reflect a condition born of a vicious intent and a criminal neglect on the part of this highest inner policy-making circle in our Government.

We have already discussed the plight of France, and England, and Germany. Russia is struggling with a situation in which twenty-five to fifty million of her seventy million homeless are starving. Italy is in such desperate circumstances that on January 19 UNRRA increased its aid to the starving Italian people almost a thousand percent.

On January 6, Gen. F. H. Stayner reported to UNRRA:

"Some 54 percent of the entire Greek population is utterly destitute with regard to food and clothing."

On December 31 Gen. Mark Clark said he had been compelled to requisition food and other goods to be brought into Vienna to alleviate suffering in the American occupation zone.

On January 4, Dr. W. A. Sawyer, Director of Health for UNRRA, stated:

"Upon returning from Warsaw, Lublin, Krakow, I found epidemics of typhus, typhoid, and diphtheria are to be feared in Poland this winter. The people lack almost everything—food, clothing, shelter. Everything except courage."

UNRRA has just allocated \$4,000,000 of relief for Hungary that will not scratch the surface. Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Rumania have been stripped of all available food—stocks and supplies. And Moscow-sponsored armies are foraging for their very existence on the countryside.

On January 31, a member of the Indian Government in charge of the food department, cabled the British Government:

"India faces a famine of the gravest dimensions this summer—far worse than the Bengal famine of 1943."

Not long ago a combined board of experts, writing in the Washington Daily News, stated:

"Large sections of China are facing death by starvation. Chinese families have been hungry the last 10 years. This year they are worrying about which ones in the family will be dead by spring or if they all will be dead."

On January 9, the New York Times carried the following story:

"With the revelation that Korea—which normally exported annually to Japan between thirty-six and fifty-four million bushels of rice—this year would almost certainly be able to ship nothing, squabbles among Allied officials over Japan's food supply have suddenly taken on a graver aspect."

"It is no longer a secret here that the movement northward across Russian borders has been heavy ever since October, with the Soviet Army removing Japanese technicians to Siberia, as well as plant machinery and food. As a result of the Manchurian food exodus, Korea above the thirty-eighth parallel which is Russian controlled, is probably short-rationed unless it is supplied with rice from the American zone. The American zone, which is Korea's rice bowl, is not receiving other grains from north Korea and Manchuria and must eat its own bumper rice crop largely unsupplemented. Thus south Korea will have a diet closely comparable to Japanese urban fare."

And what are the conditions in Japan, Mr. President? General MacArthur has requested 2,000,000 metric tons of wheat immediately to enable him to raise the present starvation level in Japan to 2,000 calories in order to avoid an outbreak of violence.

On January 1 Governor Lehman, himself Director of UNRRA, in a radio address, warned the UNRRA would not be able to bind up every wound or feed every child that cries for help. Governor Lehman warned America: "In Europe and in China there are millions of maimed and broken bodies without adequate medicine or even clothing to keep themselves warm, and there are millions of children who are hungry. The needs of weary humanity are overpowering."

And now, Mr. President, while these vicious policies directed toward the extermination of the German state and people have been carried on by blind fanatics, our own State Department officials and Governor Lehman himself warn us that this clique has had its own way so long and has ignored the larger problems arising out of this war to such an extent that our allies themselves have been betrayed.

The third issue, Mr. President, is the issue of world cooperation and world peace which are all intimately wrapped up with the ultimate fate of Germany. This same group who by their very actions have already condemned themselves as fanatics have even stooped to sabotage the precarious relationships existing among the big powers without any thought of the dreadful consequences that were sure to follow if they could only wreak their blind hatred on a prostrate people. One after another, this same clique has hurled charges and insinuations and smears at France, Britain, and Russia in order to cover their own tracks. I have been reliably informed that certain members of the military government in Berlin, in order to gain time for their own vicious ends, actually destroyed a document signed by Marshal Zhukov in which the Russian commander agreed to the initiation of an interzonal arrangement among the Big Four. The blame for the failure of American occupation policies in Germany has constantly been laid at the door of either Britain, Russia, or France, or, if the occasion warranted, General Patton could be attacked. Or General MacArthur could be smeared and maligned.

This clique of fanatics has been willing to stop at nothing to gain its own end. Even if international complications and mortal threats to world peace were involved.

Mr. President, the record convinces me that while this same clique has been willing to use any means to attain its end, its basic and single purpose and concern has been to destroy Germany. At this very moment this group who formulated the Morgenthau plan, who repudiated the American plan for the treatment of Germany drawn up in our State Department, continue to single Germany out of all the victorious and conquered nations of the world for the following treatment. In the first place there is no relation in the degree of the desire for vengeance they display between Japan and Germany. The press and radio they control is overwhelmingly directed at Germany and the German people. Second, as of this moment Germany is the only nation in the world whose nationals are permitted neither to send nor to receive 1 ounce of food, mail, medicine, clothing, or a word of commiseration. UNRRA is not permitted to function within Germany where German nationals are concerned. Some thirty million loyal and patriotic Americans, whose fathers and mothers, whose brothers and sisters, whose relatives and friends are walled in behind an iron curtain of complete isolation from the outside world, together with all of the charitable and religious groups in this country—are unable to minister directly to what has now become only part of a staggering human need.

The fourth issue at stake is whether this country is to function as a constitutional representative republic through its elected servants from the President down, or whether it is to be forced to continue to be the puppet of a vicious conspiratorial clique who, in deliberate defiance of the will of the vast masses of the American people, and without regard for the consequences to the rest of the world, continue to bleed and to mulct the last vestiges of a liberty-loving people, to feed their own lust for revenge.

This issue involves the answers to the following questions:

1. What are the conditions that really exist behind all this smoke of propaganda and confusion?

2. What are the directives that have actually been issued and how are they being put into practice?

3. Who has been responsible for the ghastly tragedy now confronting us?

Mr. President, everything this administration touches in Europe is turning to ashes. Every single directive that has been issued for the treatment of Germany has become a whited sepulchre filled with infants' bones. Who is it that has been responsible for forcing the acceptance of the Morgenthau plan as anything that even remotely represents the things America stands for and the things for which her sons have bled and died?

Mr. President, America can no longer hide behind excuses or evasions or propaganda. The time has come for America to act, and I urge the enthusiastic support of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Nebraska, calling for the immediate appointment of a congressional committee to investigate American policies which are imposing mass starvation on any peoples anywhere.

GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE WITH PRODUCTION

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, 9 months have passed since VE-day and almost half a year since VJ-day. After brief periods of exultation the long-suffering

American people settled back to wait patiently for what they had every right to expect—a veritable flood of civilian goods after the lapse of a reasonable length of time.

Economists freely predicted that if such a flood of civilian goods—particularly automobiles and consumer durable goods—could be put on the market it would sop up a lot of the excess purchasing power prevailing in this Nation, and keep prices from rising. The one watchword to a stable peacetime economy was "production."

Millions of Americans who had gone without automobiles for years knew that it would be 6 or 8 months before they could be satisfied. But they were willing to wait 6 or 8 months patiently. They knew that plants would have to retool, workers would have to be retrained, other work done. Now the 6 or 8 months have passed and, to the hundreds of thousands of Americans who expected new automobiles, the waiting becomes more and more unbearable.

Millions of housewives who normally would have purchased electrical washing machines, or electrical ironers, or dozens of other needed home appliances during the years 1942 through 1945, forebore these seminecessities with little complaining, realizing that there was a war on. They said to themselves last summer: "Only a few more months now and I can go and buy the electrical equipment I need." But can they? There is arising a dull and despairing feeling that even within another 6 months or a year they will not be able to rid themselves of the drudgeries which they had a right to be rid of before now.

They have waited and waited and waited—apparently with little sympathy from the highest echelons of power here in Washington.

Millions of farmers and suburban dwellers, the men and women who make up our great middle class, thought last summer, that in a few months they would be able to have the house papered for a fair price, or could have the drain pipes fixed, or could install the new electrical pump they intended to buy, or could switch over to electrical milkers or other labor-saving machinery. But they have waited and waited and waited. And today, to many millions of them, it seems as if they will wait forever.

They have the money with which to make the purchases. Many of them are willing to pay a premium for the things they need, for if they had the implements to use, they could save the difference in a few short weeks.

All of them know that the shortage of these appliances and implements is not caused by lack of facilities. They have seen the reports of the administration showing that, by and large, American industry has reconverted quickly and much more speedily than was dreamed possible last summer.

The millions who are waiting for these things include union laborers as well as nonunion laborers. Yet, all suffer alike, because the greatest industrial machine every built in the history of the world is stalled on dead center.

Mr. President, every Senator's mail is heavy with complaints from people whose plans for production have been thwarted by interference of our Government in their efforts. Every Senator's office is besieged by businessmen who have come to Washington to try to get a sensible adjustment of the difficulties which block their ability to produce. I shall cite two examples. Within a few days an Indianapolis man who has a large construction contract for supplying fabricated steel for a building told me that the Office of Price Administration sometime ago had allowed him a \$10 spread between the cost of the material and the ceiling prices he could get for his product, within which range he was restricted for the payment of all the labor, overhead, and other expenses necessary for the fabrication of the steel.

These costs had absorbed within 25 cents of the 10-dollar range, and if the Government authorizes an increase in the price of steel of from \$4 to \$6, as is contemplated, he will have to close down his operations unless a new ceiling price is permitted on his product. He could get no encouragement that he will receive an adjusted price. Much building in his area will thereby be stagnated.

Indiana produces 60 percent of the lawn mowers made in the country, but out in Richmond and Muncie lawn mowers are being stored in warehouses because the OPA will not give the manufacturers a price which will permit them to recover the cost of production. At the same time it gives to a new manufacturer who did not make lawn mowers before the war a price which would be satisfactory to the old-established manufacturers, but is denied them.

In the case of the wood office-furniture field, for instance, in which my State also is a leader, if OPA persists in keeping this industry under the present theory of price control, it will be only a short time before OPA will have to set prices on from 100 to 2,000 new designs, depending upon the time the new designs are completed and ready for prices. These are but a few of hundreds of similar industries which ought to be out from under price control now—and would be, under any sensibly administered reconversion program.

It is common knowledge that no one can buy shirts and no one can buy stockings because OPA will not permit prices sufficiently inviting to move them, and textile production is going into lines in which profit is more inviting.

We are long on laws but short on shorts.

What good is price control on non-existent automobiles, nonexistent electric washers, nonexistent homes, nonexistent office desks, warehoused shirts, stockings, and lawnmowers?

Factories all over the country are closing down daily because of their inability to get parts which cannot be supplied at the ceiling prices allowed.

Hundreds of thousands of American workmen are out of jobs on strikes because their wage demands cannot be met by the industry on the ceiling price enforced.

Mr. President, the economic foundation of our country is trembling and the whole structure will collapse unless early action is taken to remove the hindrances to full production and full employment in this country.

The American people have two choices of action to take in the present situation. One is complete regimentation of the country in the matter of production and distribution, employment, wages, and prices, on the plan of a total socialized state, adjusting and regulating the affairs of our citizens to the minutest detail. That plan is abhorrent to the tradition and to the present-day desires of the American people. It is out the window to start with.

The second choice is to give the Government back to the people, and let them regulate their own affairs and work out their own adjustment of prices and of production and of distribution under the natural laws of economics.

The way to begin this reform is to throw out the window the system of price control which the Government operated during the war. It must be drastically revised on the basis of production rather than stagnation. Phantom price lines have long since faded before the actual facts of rising costs.

The course suggested was urged upon the administration last week by Mr. Henry Ford 2d, and certainly the history of his remarkable industrial institution as an outstanding example of the American way of economics, compels us to give close consideration to it.

But I hear the question raised, "What about rents in this day of acute housing shortage?" It will be agreed that during the period of growing scarcity of housing and the inability to produce housing facilities, rent control accomplished a useful purpose, but it was most unjust to property owners who had to neglect proper upkeep of their property. What a travesty it is that our soldiers who went out to fight for our country have to come home to squalid quarters, temporary housing, and camp trailers to shelter themselves and their loved ones from the storm. A government that does not remedy that situation at once is, indeed, ungrateful.

In the present situation a system of rent control which refuses to give a fair rental return for the money invested in building will simply prolong the shortage of housing facilities. In the long run the only way that rents will be reduced is by the production of an ample supply of housing facilities, or by the break-down of our economy to such an extent that people in order to exist will have to double up and use less rental space. Manifestly, the desirable way is through increase in housing facilities. Unless an immediate revision is made of the rent-control policy, so that property owners may get a fair return on their investment, the housing shortage will grow increasingly critical, and when the controls are removed at the end of wartime powers the inflationary prices will mount far above the point to which they would now go if the controls were gradually eased, looking forward to the time

when they must and will be removed altogether.

The hold-the-line policy has been a delusion and a snare. We have spent billions in subsidies to delude the American people into thinking that prices are lowered, when subsidies have only added to inflation and to the debt which the people will have to pay with harder-earned dollars tomorrow. The black market has added to the cost of living and people have been driven away from the just use of our money system as a medium of exchange to a barter system which OPA cannot control. We read in the papers this week that in one western State a carload of corn was swapped for an automobile tire, and that in another State corn was being traded for nylon stockings. People will find a way to satisfy their desires whenever Government steps in and tries to restrict them. That has been proven time and time again in America. Why can we not heed the lesson?

Mr. President, we are all talking about inflation as some future danger which we should seek to avoid. Inflation is already here. It has grown with the expanding public debt, the expanding currency, and the devaluation of the dollar. When we lowered the purchasing power of the dollar we increased prices. When we paid out huge sums of money on a deficit financing basis, so that every earning family piled up a huge buying power; when we restricted the production of certain goods in order to care for our wartime needs, we built a higher level of nominal values to which our economy must be geared. We will have to have higher prices, we will have to have higher wages, we will have to adjust salaries to this higher level, or there will be no production. This is an elementary law of economics, and cannot be thwarted by theorists sitting in swivel chairs in Government buildings in Washington.

The Office of Price Administration may have served a useful purpose during the war. It never was administered on the sound basis which its framers intended, that is, that when production costs increased in certain levels they should be reflected in the cost of the finished product. At the taxpayers' expense Mr. Bowles and his associates have been propagandizing the country with a false philosophy. They have been holding rallies, they have been scaring the people with a bogey of inflation, they have been telling the Nation that they are supermen whose plans can control prices, they have been misleading our people with the subtlest form of demagoguery. Their practices are so patently unsound that one is forced to the conclusion that they are deliberately planning to wreck the American system of freedom in production, in labor, and in business, laying the ground work for some new form of regulated society.

One of our wisest Presidents once said, "This Nation cannot remain half slave and half free." That statement is just as true today. We cannot have a half-socialized state and a half-free economy, and the pity of it is that if we attempt it we will become altogether a socialized state. Let us take the Government back

home to the people; let us keep this a free Nation. Let us begin now; the time is already late. God help us that it may not be too late.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, following the conclusion of my remarks, resolutions adopted by members of the Marion County Residential Builders, Inc.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the members of the Marion County Residential Builders, Inc., are ready, willing, and able to undertake the construction of any and all housing units needed to adequately and satisfactorily house everyone now in the market for a new home, and regardless of whether the person or family in need wishes to purchase or rent such a home; and

Whereas building crews including craftsmen of all types are available for immediate employment.

And since financing of home building is known to be more than ample for all requirements.

And further since the production of more and more new homes or dwelling units is the only solution to the present housing problem.

And since no agency can provide new housing any faster than the supply of materials will permit or build or cheaply or as well as the private builders are ready and willing and able to do so.

And further since it is known that the general shortage of materials and supplies for home construction is the only deterrent prevalent at this time in this locality in the home building industry.

And further since it is evident that the shortage of materials and supplies is due chiefly to the operation of price controls promulgated and applied to the sale of building materials and supplies by the Office of Price Administration: Therefore be it

Resolved by the members of the Marion County Residential Builders, Inc., in regular meeting assembled, That no legislation such as the Wagner-Ellender-Taft measure will serve to correct or be of any benefit in the present housing shortage but will instead place additional difficulties in the way and further stifle the construction of homes by private builders and that for these reasons the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill as well as the Patman bill should be defeated; and be it further

Resolved, That the present situation demands the abrogation of price-control regulations on building materials and supplies in order to remove the stifling effect of these regulations on production and thus enable the manufacturers to increase the production of such materials and supplies and permit the home-building industry to proceed with the construction of new homes as rapidly as the production and supply of materials can be increased; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be furnished to the press and to each Member of Congress, representing the people of the State of Indiana.

A. M. H. GRAVES,
President.

Attest:

ELMER E. MEADLEY,
Executive Secretary.

Adopted January 15, 1946.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, an editorial from the Washington News of January 28, 1946, entitled "Please Let Me Make My Zippers."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"PLEASE LET ME MAKE MY ZIPPERS"

The strike situation looks a little better.

The CIO meat strikers have wisely changed their minds and gone back to work in the Government-seized packing plants. Their wage dispute isn't settled, but the country will get some meat. Ford and Chrysler have granted wage raises a little more than half as big as the CIO auto union first demanded. That's probably about what most CIO unions expected to get, and most big industries to give, in the first place, before the issue got all snarled up in politics and bitterness.

So, perhaps, we can hope for fairly early settlement of the General Motors strike, the electrical-goods strike, and others, including even the great steel strike. These labor-management battles have cost the country a terrible lot of money, time, and production. And the wage increases will be cut down by higher prices unless production comes fast, big, and quick—unless all concerned get to work and work hard.

Why this is so has seldom been better explained than it was the other day by David Silberman, a New York zipper manufacturer. Mr. Silberman decided that the whole labor problem "was being approached too much from the political and pedagogical angles." The average man "was being kicked around too much."

So he sat down in his hotel room and wrote an advertisement—"A plea from a bewildered small businessman to the United States Government, my Government, to labor, to management." Then he took it around and had it printed, full-page, in the New York Times. It deserves even wider circulation. Here's what it said:

"I manufacture zippers. I cannot get enough tape. I cannot get enough metal. I cannot get enough labor. I cannot get enough of anything except customers. If I could get enough material and enough labor, and my competitors could, too, very soon between us we would make so many zippers—the competition would be so keen—that there would be no possibility of inflation, at least so far as zippers are concerned.

"What is true of my business—zippers—is true of buttons and dresses and fabrics and steel and autos and locomotives and finger bowls and toothpicks and of apple sauce.

"Production, competition, the ingenuity of management, the cooperation of labor is what will prevent inflation, not Government regulation. So—

"Labor—please stop your strikes. Management—please pay your employee a higher wage, remember he is your best customer. Government—trust us, don't regulate us. We'll hold the line—voluntarily.

"Please, everybody, get together and let me make my zippers."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1085) for the relief of Mrs. Celia Ellen Ashcraft.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2223) for the relief of Catherine Bode; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. MORRISON, and Mr. PITTINGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amend-

ment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2267) for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. COMBS, and Mr. JENNINGS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

APPEAL FROM DECISION OF THE CHAIR ON CLOTURE MOTION

The Senate resumed consideration of the appeal of Mr. BARKLEY from the decision of the Chair sustaining the point of order of Mr. RUSSELL that, under the rule, the presentation of the cloture motion on the FEPC bill was not in order.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] stated what was really behind this measure. He stated that social equality was not an issue; yet he admitted that the bill would establish certain practices which were aimed at bringing about social equality in this country. Behind the bill, Mr. President, there is not only an attempt to bring about social equality and racial amalgamation, but the bill itself constitutes an attack upon the segregation statutes of the Southern States. It exemplifies the ideology and the governmental philosophy of Harlem and of the Bronx and is an attempt to impose the governmental philosophy of Harlem over the rest of the United States.

The city of New York is a great city, but, Mr. President, the ideals, the philosophy, the ideology of the masses of its people are entirely foreign to the governmental conceptions of the masses of the people who make up America, and the people who built America and made her great.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, a point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, according to the rules of the Senate, it is out of order for any Member to refer offensively to any State of the Union. To hold up the State of New York or any part of it to ridicule by comparison with other States or with the people of other States is offensive and in violation of the rule. I should like to have a ruling upon the point of order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair rules that what the Senator from Mississippi said, properly construed, is not offensive to the State of New York. The Chair is aware that there is such a rule, but the Chair holds that it has not been violated by the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, Mr. President, I have not said anything offensive to the State of New York. The philosophy of this bill is backed, as I believe the distinguished Senator from New York has stated, by the people of his State, and I submit that that is all I have said in this instance. But I may say that the Members of the southern delegation in Congress are charged with being Fascists and are being ridiculed. I saw an article to that effect today, written by I. F. Stone. We are being ridiculed by individuals such as he at a time when the South, Mr. President, is standing for Americanism as against communism, when we are trying to protect our country, when we are trying to preserve the future of our country so as to hand down to our children and our children's children the kind of country we love and the kind of country we have helped create.

Mr. President, before going into the jurisprudence of this bill as compared to that of Soviet Russia, I should like to call attention to two of the provisions of the bill. On page 10, line 9, appears this provision:

Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory or possession thereof.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Mississippi leaves the subject he was discussing, will he permit me to interpolate a few words?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator has mentioned the fact that the real issues involved in this bill have not been submitted to the American people; that the issues involved in this controversy have, in some cases, been deliberately misrepresented. For example, Time, a magazine of very wide circulation, holding itself out as being reliable in the information it carries, denominated the opposition to this bill as an effort on the part of southern Senators to prevent the Negro population receiving any increase in their wages. Of course, the Senator knows that such a statement, from whatever source it might come, is wholly false.

One of the proponents of the bill on the floor of the Senate today states the real purpose which is back of the measure. When the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] states that he is for this bill because it vests a Federal bureau with the power to strike down any idea of the separation of the races in any of the relations of life he states one real reason for the opposition of those of us who are opposing the bill. We know, even though that knowledge cannot be carried to the people of the Nation generally, that this bill is designed to undertake to force social equality, miscegenation of the races, amalgamation of the races and eventually a mongrel American race. We know that that is the primary purpose back of the bill.

Some proponents of the bill denounce us and in one breath say that we wish to deny equal economic opportunities, and in the next breath say that they

think the mere fact that in a given establishment separate toilet facilities, although identical in character, are provided for the white man and for the black man is a discriminatory practice, and that if this practice is not eliminated everywhere in the United States the owners of the enterprises ought to be put in jail. Not only would the owners of such enterprises be put in jail but under the terms of the bill if the employees within a plant objected to having separate eating facilities or toilet facilities for the races, the mere fact that the owner did not discharge the employees of his plant who so objected would subject him to a sentence in jail and to all the harassments and punishments the bill devises.

Mr. President, there has never been a greater fraud perpetrated upon the American people than the deliberate attempt that has been made to create the impression that we are opposing economic equality in fighting this bill. Those who drew the bill, those who gave it life, and those who gave the distorted news to the American people know that the main purpose back of this measure is to make of it a force bill, to break down the segregation of the races which we have found essential to harmonious life in the Southern States.

They have done it here already in all of the departments in Washington. In the name of fairness they have in the District of Columbia demanded and obtained the employment of twice as many colored people in the departments of Government as the total proportion of colored population bears to the whole population of these United States. They have gone into the departments of Washington and have changed customs which have prevailed under Republican administrations and under Democratic administrations, which provided some little measure of separation of the races in the more intimate affairs of life. Then some individuals pillory us on every radio, in practically every press column, as opposing a bill to prevent discrimination, when we are merely fighting to sustain in our country a way of life which both the white man and the black man approve as being essential to harmony in racial relations in the South.

Mr. President, it is simple enough to sit in the cloistered halls on some campus in the East or in some great law office in an eastern city or in a western city where a Negro is not seen more than once every 2 months, and solve all these problems when dealing with them in the abstract. In my State, which has the largest Negro population of any State in the Union, which has 46 counties in which the colored people greatly outnumber the white people, we have a little different slant on these matters. Men of good faith, both white and black, have worked tirelessly in the South in the 80 years since the great tragedy of the War Between the States, to formulate a pattern of relationships between the races which would be fair to all. We have made our blunders, but through a process of trial and error we have made great progress.

Not satisfied with our pattern of life, the proponents of the bill seek to create a monumental Federal agency with vast powers, greater than those of any other agency ever previously contemplated, to strike down that pattern and, whether the people of the Southern States wish it or not, to compel them to accept the views of those in other sections in regard to segregation.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator means the views of Harlem.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have never considered segregation any more of a discrimination against the Negro than it is against the white man. I have never been able to understand the monumental inferiority complex which causes the proponents of the bill to take this position. For my part I would not consider it a discrimination against me—I have too much personal pride—if the finest restaurant in the city of Washington had a sign on it "For Negroes only." I would never think of devising ways and means of crashing into that restaurant, where I was not wanted; and I cannot understand the mental attitude of those who would.

Whatever may be the pretense here, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY] let the cat out of the bag in answer to certain questions when he practically admitted that the purpose in creating this powerful agency is to force us, in the departments of government, in the smallest enterprises, in all our plants, all our offices, and all our stores employing more than 6 persons, to accept the views of a radical board as to what is unfair and discriminatory employment practice.

Mr. President, I shall not trespass further upon the time of the Senator from Mississippi. In my own time I propose to discuss a number of rulings of the limited Committee on Fair Employment Practice which has been in existence, to supplement the admission of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the purpose is not economic equality, but to force the acceptance of certain ideas of social life in this country, and eventually to see that the white race of this land of ours is mongrelized with a minority race, the colored race.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia made reference to a quotation from Time Magazine. The article declared that the issue in this contest is that the opponents of the bill are against adequate wages for the Negro in the South. That statement is a fraud and a falsehood. Mr. President, today the highest wage scales in the United States are those of cotton pickers in the fields of the South. In the South today we have the highest wage scale in the country.

This bill does not involve economic equality. It involves social equality. Let us be frank about it. There is an attempt to tear down the social institutions of the South, institutions which protect the racial integrity of both races; and it is proposed to mongrelize them. There is behind this whole program a plan to have sent to the Senate of the United States a different type of men to represent the Southern States so that this country may be made over into a

Marxist state. The southern delegation in the United States Senate is now standing between the people of the country and Marxism.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Apropos of the question just discussed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell] and the Senator from Mississippi, I should like to read a few paragraphs from an editorial of Saturday, February 2, 1946, entitled "The Battle of the Century," published in the Pittsburgh Courier, which is a newspaper owned and published by some colored folk. The editorial reads in part as follows:

The current struggle in the United States Senate over the Fair Employment Practice Commission is, from the viewpoint of the long struggle to make this a democratic country, the battle of the century.

Not since the fight to pass the Civil War amendments to the Federal Constitution has there been such a clear-cut fight against feudalism, racism, and reaction.

The editorial further states:

As was to be expected the Southern oligarchy, through its one-party representatives, is lined up 100 percent against any consideration of a Fair Employment Practice Commission on a permanent basis, just as it has stood unanimously against any legislation designed to break down the color bar in this country.

This paragraph states the issue:

Many years ago a Southern white writer succinctly stated the issue: that if Negroes gained economic equality, they could not be long denied political equality, and if these two qualities were achieved, complete social equality would not be far off, hence it was absolutely essential that they be prevented from gaining economic equality, lest the whole racial structure of southern life be destroyed and the tides of life flow together.

There in a few words the issue is stated. Before this debate is over I propose to show what happened to the civilizations of Egypt, India, Haiti, and South America, and what has happened in Harlem, showing what mongrelization will do to a nation, and what it will do to our country if we enact legislation of this kind, which would lead to social equality. I am convinced that political equality will lead to social equality.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. It will lead to social equality, which will result in the degradation of our race. I expect to prove that historically when the time comes.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I desire to leave the city for a week or two. I should like to know how long the Senator from Louisiana expects to speak.

Mr. ELLENDER. During the debate on the antilynching bill I had the privilege of occupying this floor for 11 successive days. Of course, I have grown a little older, but I think I can do as well, and perhaps better. I do not wish to boast as to what I am able to do. Before the debate started I made the statement that, so far as I was concerned, I would talk as long as God gave me breath; and that statement still stands.

Mr. EASTLAND. I hope the Senator will speak until I return. When the

time comes, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. President, I read from page 10 of the bill, which provides that the attendance of witnesses and the production of evidence may be required from any place in the United States or any Territory thereof.

Subparagraph (2) of section 3 provides that it shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer—

(2) to discharge any person from employment because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

It is admitted that if the bill is enacted, when a member of a minority group is discharged from employment a complaint may be brought under that provision of section 3. Great numbers of complaints without merit would be made.

Under the provisions of section 11, on page 10, when a complaint is filed, even though it may have no merit, the respondent may be brought from Hawaii to New York City. He may be called away from his home, his business, and his family, and be forced to travel 1,000 miles to a hearing. We all know that such proceedings are slow-moving, and that many delays are involved. A person may be brought a thousand miles to one hearing and forced to go across the country to another. Is that the American system? In civil cases in the district courts of the United States witnesses cannot be forced to come from more than 100 miles outside the district in which the court is held. That is totalitarianism, Mr. President. It is a destruction of the private rights of American citizens.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Under such procedure as the Senator has described, a man might be taken from one side of the country to another without respect to the crossing of State lines.

Mr. EASTLAND. And in connection with complaints which had no merit.

Mr. STEWART. What is the need for a State? What function will States perform hereafter? What is the need of having a State?

Mr. EASTLAND. None at all.

Mr. STEWART. What would it amount to?

Mr. EASTLAND. Nothing.

Mr. STEWART. What would the Governor be but a mere political satrap? What would a State be, other than a mere province? What would be the need of having States?

Mr. EASTLAND. A State would not even be a province.

Mr. STEWART. Under the Senator's construction of the proposed law, and the things that could be done under it by the Commission which would be appointed, as I understand, if the Commission so desired, it could prepare a case against a man in California, through investigators whom it would send there for that purpose. A trial might be held in the city of Washington, where the Commission might sit, and the accused person would be forced to come all the way across the continent to attend the trial at Washington.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly; and he might then be forced to go to another hearing, perhaps in St. Louis, or to as many hearings as the Commission might wish to hold.

Mr. STEWART. Would the defendant have any access to the court by way of appeal?

Mr. EASTLAND. None at all. The authority of the Commission would be greater than the authority of a court under the Russian system. Under the Communist system, which I was discussing yesterday, and shall continue to discuss in a moment, the calling of a witness for either the prosecution or the defendant is within the discretion of the court. But in this case it would be mandatory, and a man could be forced to travel thousands of miles away from his family, his home, and his business, to answer a picayunish complaint made by a mongrel Communist bureaucrat.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to the language on page 13 of the bill. Section 14 reads as follows:

SEC. 14. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies, in the performance of duties pursuant to this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

Under that section if any person interferes with an agent of the Commission in what the agent conceives to be his duty under the act, he is liable to punishment by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment in the penitentiary for not more than 1 year.

Here is a section which shows that the Commission could go to the place of business of an individual, examine his books, examine his records, and make copies thereof. Mr. President, I maintain that beyond peradventure of doubt that provision is rotten and because of it alone this bill is a monstrous thing.

Let me read the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

If a citizen of this country were to stand on his rights under the American Constitution and were to say, "You have no warrant; you have no probable cause to search my books. I forbid you to do it. I am an American citizen, and the Constitution gives me the right to refuse," yet he could be indicted, called into court, and placed in the Federal penitentiary and fined \$5,000, within the discretion of the judge.

Mr. President, I submit that is totalitarianism, that is destruction of the rights of individual American citizens, in line with the Communist philosophy which has invaded this country.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Missis-

sippi yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator was referring to some of the penalties provided for by the bill. Will he repeat them?

Mr. EASTLAND. I read section 14, on page 13, of the bill:

WILLFUL INTERFERENCE WITH COMMISSION AGENTS

SEC. 14. Any person who shall willfully resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any member of the Commission or any of its referees, agents, or agencies in the performance of duties pursuant to this act shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Mr. STEWART. How would the imprisonment and fine be imposed?

Mr. EASTLAND. I judge by indictment and by trial in a United States district court.

Mr. STEWART. They would be imposed by a court?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course.

Mr. STEWART. That would be taking some authority away from the Commission; would it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; but if an individual were to interfere with the right, under the bill, of one of the Commission's agents, he would be indicted for a misdemeanor and would be tried in a United States district court, and would be punished, if found guilty.

Mr. STEWART. The Commission would have powers as set out from time to time in the bill—powers which are practically equivalent to the rights of a court in a criminal case; are they not?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to read section 9, beginning on page 6, of the bill:

LOCATION OF OFFICES

SEC. 9. The Commission shall hold its sessions in the District of Columbia and at such other places as it may designate. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such referees, agents, or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry or conduct any hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States or any Territory or insular possession thereof.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is in connection with employment practices.

Mr. STEWART. It applies to any of the Commission's functions; does it not?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. I read further:

PROHIBITION OF UNFAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission is empowered as herein provided to prohibit any person from engaging in any unfair employment practices within the scope of this act.

Suppose a man were to violate some of the provisions of the bill, and thus become subject to a charge of unfair practice; what then would be the modus operandi of the Commission?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Commission then would investigate and would issue a cease-and-desist order or an order to reinstate the employee or employees. If the employer failed to obey the order, he would be cited for contempt in a United States Circuit Court of Appeals, and the court would hear the case on the basis of the record and would be bound

by the Commission's findings of fact, regardless of whether there was any evidence at all, either competent or incompetent, to sustain the judgment of the Commission.

Mr. STEWART. Under this bill the circuit court would be bound, would it not, to impose upon the firm or individual the Commission had investigated, a fine or sentence for contempt of court?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. How long could the defendant be kept in jail?

Mr. EASTLAND. Indefinitely—as long as in the opinion of the court it would take to purge him of the contempt.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator think that the sweeping powers and authority proposed to be given this Commission would violate the Constitution of the United States, particularly the fourth and sixth amendments to the Constitution?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course, they would violate the Constitution. But does not the Senator know that it is just a bluff held over the heads of the American people to make them acquiesce in the denial of their rights?

Mr. STEWART. What is the Senator's construction of the provisions set forth in section 1 which refers to the declaration of policy and states that certain practices which are referred to therein adversely affect commerce—in other words, interstate commerce?

Mr. EASTLAND. Today, in the United States, interstate commerce means anything that our present Supreme Court may guess at. The distinguished Senator from Tennessee knows how I feel about that court, and I am certain that my feelings are shared by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. President, here is what is behind this bill: As the Senator stated so well yesterday, this whole thing is an attempt to bring about racial amalgamation in this country, and to bring it about under the guise of fostering economic equality. Everyone believes in economic equality. Economic equality is practised in the South today. But those who back the bill realize that if they could destroy the social institutions of the South, then they could send to the Senate of the United States from the Southern States men who would acquiesce in legislation which would destroy our country. I submit that I do not wish to see the South in the control of the crowd which today rules a great many States north of the Mason and Dixon's line and along the Atlantic seaboard. That is one of the issues involved in this matter. Let us be frank about it.

Mr. STEWART. Before I take my seat I should like to read the seventh amendment to the Constitution, merely for purposes of comparison:

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed twenty dollars, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by jury shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. Of course, that applies to the common law alone.

But the absurdity of the proposals of the bill are to be seen by the comparison. This bill, as the Senator from Mississippi has well stated, would take away practically every bit and vestige of right which a man has to control his own property or control the operation of his own business, to manage his own firm, if he employed more than six persons, and yet suit could not be brought against him at common law, if he owed the person bringing the suit as much as \$20, unless he had the right to have the case tried before a jury in a court. However, rights worth perhaps a thousand times as much as \$20 could be flouted by the Commission set up under this pernicious piece of legislation, Senate bill 101.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as I shall tell the Senator from Tennessee in a moment, the procedure of trial by men who would serve as judges, and their qualifications and their powers to conduct a trial, as provided by the bill, are identical with those provided under the system in vogue in Soviet Russia. It is absolutely uncanny how similar the provisions of this bill are to those of the Soviet system. Seemingly it must have been written so as to conform to the Communist system. I intend to show that. I have the Russian Code on my desk, and what I have just stated can be shown conclusively, beyond peradventure of doubt. But the people of this country do not realize that communism is behind this move.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to observe, if the Senator will permit me, that the United States of America is the last Nation on the face of the earth where humanity has any rights at all which are respected or which have been respected in the past, and I state that if this bill is passed it will be the beginning of the everlasting, eternal end of democracy here, and we in the United States will confront the same conditions which now face the people of other lands.

It is the beginning of what has taken place in other lands. It is the beginning of what has been used in the past to destroy every form of free government which history records. It is the beginning of that which will take away from humanity every vestige of the liberties which it may now have, including the right to worship God according to the conscience of the individual.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator cannot cite a single instance in the United States of a person having been denied the right to worship according to his choice of religion.

Mr. EASTLAND. One of the primary objectives of communism is the destruction of the Christian religion. As the Senator has said, if the pending bill should become law we would continue to drift. I contend that the drift which has already taken place in America must be arrested.

Mr. STEWART. Under the seventh amendment to the Constitution a very important protection is afforded every American citizen. If, for example, a man unlawfully takes \$20 from someone else, he has a right to have a trial by jury. Yet, under the pending bill,

everything which the accused might possess could be taken away from him. I wonder if the Senator has given consideration to the question of whether, if the pending bill becomes law, the accused might have even as much as \$20 left after his entire business had perhaps been destroyed, and he had been denied the right of a trial by jury.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from what I have read about the Russian system, by enacting into law the pending bill, we would be installing a similar system of procedure in the United States. As the Senator from Tennessee knows, the jurisdiction of the proposed agency would be very wide. If the agency were once established and it began to set up rules, it would increase considerably its jurisdiction.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Mississippi discusses the laws which now exist in Russia, as he said he would do, I wonder if he will state whether or not he has been able to find anything touching upon this point: In section 11 of the bill, on page 11, unique language may be discovered. I should like to have the Senator's view with regard to it. I understand that under our present laws, when a person is called before any kind of an investigatory body, whether it be a grand jury or some other body, he has the right to refuse to answer certain questions, particularly if by answering them he may later be prosecuted for a crime.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was unable to follow the Senator, but my attention was temporarily diverted. May I ask him to restate his question?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a provision in the Constitution which gives an accused the right to refuse to answer a particular kind of question, such as, for example, a question which might incriminate him. I wish to quote from the bill, paragraph (c) of section 11:

(c) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to the subpoena of the Commission, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture, but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or produce evidence, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

I wish the Senator would spend some time in telling us what, in his mind, prompted such language. Was it an attempt further to take away the rights and privileges of the individual, as the entire bill apparently seeks to do?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly that was the object in view, and it is very evident.

Mr. President, I have stated that I would discuss the Russian system of jurisprudence. I discussed it at some length yesterday. I now quote from the synopsis of the Russian system from which I read yesterday. The synopsis was compiled by a very prominent American

public office holder who graduated from the University of Moscow, and knows at first hand the system of jurisprudence now in effect in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I read:

A judicial officer who does not necessarily have to have legal training, has free hands in summoning and examining witnesses and documents, no matter to whom they may belong.

Mr. President, where do we find a similar provision in America. We find it in Senate bill 101 which proposes to give to a governmental agency very broad authority. After a complaint has been made, a representative of the Commission could interview any witnesses he might desire, put them under oath, cross examine them, and have access to all the records and documents which he might desire to examine. The provision of the bill covering that matter was taken bodily from the Code of Russian jurisprudence, a copy of which I now hold in my hand.

I go further. After the facts in the case have been established to the satisfaction of the investigator, an indictment may follow. I read further from the statement with regard to Russian jurisprudence:

And then the district attorney looks over the case and formulates the final indictment, or approves of recommendations of the examining official.

That is what would happen under the pending bill. Under the Russian system investigators from an administrative branch of the Government examine whatever witnesses they may desire to examine. They have access to all the records and documents which they may desire to bring under their scrutiny, and then they may make a recommendation of indictment to a higher official. The same system would be used under the pending bill. After the examination has been completed a recommendation would then come to the city of Washington, and there the Commission would make up the charges. Mr. President, I point out that the system provided for in the pending bill was lifted bodily from the Code of Soviet Russia.

I continue reading:

The person suspected does not know what were the testimonies of witnesses examined.

That is what we find in the pending bill—no knowledge being given to the individual at first hand of what he must face.

It is entirely within the discretion in Russia of the examining official to let the accused know the contents of the evidence against him.

Mr. President, we are asked to place our stamp of approval upon a similar procedure to be used in this country. We are asked to follow a procedure which now exists in Russia in connection with a criminal trial. We are asked to follow the Russian procedure in connection with an accused person who has not even been found to be guilty of a crime. I submit that there never was a more hideous bill introduced in the Congress of the United States than is the measure which we are now considering.

I read further from the system of procedure in effect in communistic Russia.

Here is the make-up of the Russian court:

The court is composed of a professional judge—

Just like the professional examiner the FEPC sends out—

who, again, is not necessarily trained in the law.

Exactly as in the case of an examining official under the bill. An examiner is sent out. There is no requirement in the bill that he must be trained in the law. I read further from the Russian system:

He is professional in the sense that judgeship is full-time judgeship, for which he is paid.

That is the identical system we are asked to adopt under the bill, sending out full-time examiners.

The Soviet statute does not set up any educational or legal qualifications for judgeship.

In the bill there are no educational or legal qualifications set up for a trial examiner under the FEPC. The whole thing is mimicking Russia, mimicking eastern Europe and destroying the American system of justice.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is making a very able argument to show the type of discrimination which would befall the American businessman and worker if the bill as written should become law. The Senator mentioned the fact that no qualifications are provided for examiners. I should like to ask the Senator whether or not he thinks that under the language used in the bill, in which the word "person" is employed, aliens could be used as examiners?

Mr. EASTLAND. Of course aliens could be used as examiners, and the bill gives them a preference in employment over veterans, and over other citizens of the United States.

As I stated yesterday, more than 800,000 aliens have come to the United States since the beginning of World War II, and one of the principal reasons for the pending bill is the purpose to set up an employment agency to give them a preference in employment over men who have shed their blood and offered their lives in defense of their country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I shall be glad to yield, but I desire to show the distinguished Senator from South Carolina how peculiarly and how adroitly and how intelligently section 3 of the bill is drawn. It provides:

It shall be an unfair employment practice for any employer within the scope of this act—

(1) to refuse to hire any person because of such person's race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry.

Not "any citizen of the United States," but "any person." An alien, an enemy of this country, would have a preference over a man who carries on his breast

medals of honor for valor upon the battlefield. I ask, Is it just, is it fair, is it right, that aliens and members of minority groups, should have a preference in employment over the great masses of people who make up America, who built America, and who made America strong?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has very carefully read and studied the bill. I should like to ask him whether he noticed anywhere in the bill provision for veterans' preference.

Mr. EASTLAND. The bill actually repeals the GI bill of rights, under which veterans have preference in employment, when a veteran applies for the same job sought by a member of a minority group. I should like to know what these groups have done to earn a preference in employment. Why should they be permitted to profit from discrimination against the veterans of this war in the matter of jobs after the war?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that one section of the bill requires that all those who have been employed by the FEPC for the last 2 years, during the war, shall be immediately transferred, without further ado, to the new Commission?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is an unheard of provision, and I say to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, after seeing a list of those employees, and knowing who they are, I think it would be a most monstrous thing for the Senate of the United States to approve this bill with that provision in it, and to let a crowd of mongrels, a crowd of Communists, take control of the economic and business life of our country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that many of those who during the recent trying days have come to this country from the continent of Europe, or from the Orient, came here with various types of passports, and in some instances, secured entry into this country in mysterious ways, even to the extent of being smuggled in?

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. MAYBANK. There are numbers of such aliens.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the records of the Treasury Department show that these aliens were liable to the payment of taxes on some \$6,000,000,000 of income?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to have the Senator, if he would care to do so, discuss that situation for a few moments, and tell me why these aliens were allowed to enter this country, and, before anything was done about it, were allowed to accumulate \$6,000,000,000 of income without paying the taxes due this country, when everyone else was paying his taxes. By that I do not mean to criticize the Secretary of the Treasury in the slightest.

Mr. EASTLAND. If he is responsible, he should be criticized.

Mr. MAYBANK. He is not responsible, because Secretary Vinson has been doing everything he could to cure that situation, and we in the Senate have been assured that the money will be collected before the aliens leave. I have been trying to find out who is responsible.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator from South Carolina has done remarkable work, and the people of the country are certainly indebted to him for the fight he has made to make the incomes of those people subject to taxes, whereby they must pay their share to support the Government which gives them asylum and sanctuary. They are here, and they should be treated right, of course, but why should they have preferential treatment over the citizens of this country, be they white, black, red, yellow, or whatever their color, and why should they have preferential treatment over the veteran who has been on the firing line?

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator for the kind remarks he has made, but I wish to pay my tribute to the present distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Vinson, and also the collector of internal revenue and others, who are going after these aliens to make them pay the proper taxes on the \$6,000,000,000 they have accumulated while living in this country. The records show they owe taxes on that amount of money they made in New York. How much they have in cash boxes and how much they have in their pockets no one knows.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. A great many bills are pending in Congress to tear down our immigration laws, to eat away the quota system. In my judgment, there is a concerted attempt to destroy the quota system piecemeal and to create new quotas.

Most of these bills pass the House of Representatives and come to the Senate, where they are referred to the Senate Committee on Immigration. They go to a subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Mississippi are members. There they rest and there they sleep, and I think the people of the country owe the distinguished Senator from South Carolina a great debt of gratitude for his fight in the committee to maintain inviolate the immigration policies of the United States. With those policies maintained and the defeat of such iniquitous bills as the one now pending, the United States will remain a country ruled by the old-line American citizens.

Mr. President, I read further from the statement of the Soviet statute:

The Soviet statute does not set up any educational or legal qualifications for a judgeship.

I have already stated, and I submit again, that the same is true of the pending bill. In the bill there are no educational or legal qualifications provided for trial examiners.

I read further from the statement of the Soviet Code:

Side by side with the professional judge are sitting two so-called peoples assessors. They are not professional judges, but they

are not the jurors. They are elected in the same manner as the judge, or their names are put on a list and they are called to serve in the hearing of cases, each assessor for 10 consecutive days each year. They constitute, together with the judge, the bench which decides all questions, both of law and fact.

Mr. President, the procedure prescribed by the Soviet Code in this further instance is set up in this bill. A citizen of the United States is called before an examiner who is not trained in the law, who is not qualified, who has no educational or legal qualifications, and the examiner decides the case and makes recommendations. If the American citizen does not obey his decision, he is cited for contempt in the district court or in the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States and can be placed in jail. Under this bill an American citizen does not have the right to trial by jury; it is denied him, just as it is denied in Communist Russia today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Not only does the bill not provide any standard of qualifications for the investigators and inspectors who may be sent out, but it does not even require that they be American citizens.

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Therefore under this bill, if the Commission chooses to do so, and it may do so, and it has the power to do so if the bill is enacted into law, it could select an alien, one who owes no alliance to this Government whatsoever, to make investigation, to make the seizure or the search or demand the records of any businessman who employs more than six persons.

Mr. EASTLAND. Just as is done in Russia.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And make a report to the Commission for its decision and action. Is that not correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is exactly correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator agree with me that it will be a physical and human impossibility for the Commission, as constituted under this bill, if it is set up, personally to review and consider the reports made by the several investigators and inspectors, and that, therefore, in many, many instances—I should say in most cases—it would simply be a routine matter of approving and adopting whatever report might be made by the investigator?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is certainly correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Therefore, the American citizen's liberty, his rights of property, his constitutional rights, all that he has guaranteed to him under the Constitution, all the rights he has in connection with the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness are taken away from him. In other words, his constitutional rights are subjugated to the will of a Commission, which in turn is guided and influenced in its decision and in the orders it will make by the report of an investi-

gator who is required to possess no qualifications, not even citizenship in the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. President, let us follow the Russian system further and see how the bill fits the picture. The venue of a criminal prosecution in the United States must be where the crime occurs. I think that is the universal practice in the State courts as it is in the courts of the United States. The venue of the action must be where the crime occurs. Listen to this statement as to the procedure in Russia. I quote the Russian jurisprudence:

The case may be tried by the court of the place where the crime is committed, but if it is difficult to define the place where the act was committed it may be tried by the court where the prosecution was instituted. Prosecution can be instituted in whatever district the information was found.

Think about that, Mr. President. A man can be prosecuted in Russia at whatever place a charge against him is filed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The provisions of the pending bill do not even afford comparable protection to that given under the statute of Russia. Under the pending bill, an accused person can be taken anywhere and tried.

Mr. EASTLAND. That can be done in Russia also. That is the point I make.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In Russia the individual is given a measure of preference.

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. He is given some measure of preference because the code provides that the case "may be tried" by the court where the crime was committed. It is thus left to the discretion of the court.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator did not give me time to conclude. I read further:

And it is not necessary that the accused be tried where the crime was committed. The case can be transferred from one area to another within the jurisdiction of the superior court. In civil cases the case can be tried wherever the court deems it should be tried.

Under the terms of the pending bill, an accused person could be cited at any point in the United States, Hawaii, or Alaska, and he could be tried there. In Russia, if prosecution is instituted in one district, under the superior court the case may be transferred to another district. Under the terms of this bill, if a man is cited in one district, one area, or one city of the country, the Commission may transfer the case to another city. So far as venue of actions is concerned, we have here exactly the Russian system.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I appreciate the Senator's further explanation. The first inference I drew from his statement was that in Russia there was some measure of protection of the right of a man to be

tried in his own jurisdiction unless it were inconvenient to do so. After the Senator's further explanation and comparison, it is only fair to say, and we are fully justified in saying, that certainly the pending bill gives an American citizen no more rights than are given to a citizen of Russia.

Mr. EASTLAND. It is identically the Soviet system. In this country the accused is tried near the place where the crime was committed. I submit, so far as the venue of actions is concerned, under the terms of the bill, that further right would be swept away.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator agrees that it is definitely as bad as the Russian system.

Mr. EASTLAND. I say that it is identically the Russian system, and that the similarity between the two systems is uncanny.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. Apropos of the discussion and what has been said about further regimentation of the American people and subjecting them to further snooping into their affairs under the terms of the bill, I ask the Senator if he will yield to me so that I may place in the RECORD two editorials—not bearing on this immediate subject but bearing on what I consider a similar institution.

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield with the understanding that I shall not lose the floor, and that my rights will not be prejudiced.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, both these editorials are from the Daily Oklahoman, which is published in my State. One of them is entitled "Our Modern Hercules." It reads as follows:

OUR MODERN HERCULES

More than a million shirts are stored away in various places, but Chester Bowles, OPA Administrator, decrees that they can't be sold, though returning servicemen are clear out of shirts. The ceiling price isn't the issue. It's a rule some Ph. D. economist has worked out, that to sell higher priced shirts (say the \$3 ones) manufacturers must produce a comparable number of cheap ones, which they can't do; so nobody gets any shirts. Very simple. Try it on your adding machine.

Mr. Bowles, in a heroic mood to save the people from themselves, has taken the center of the stage in the three-ring circus and refuses to get out until he has completed a series of incredible labors, which make those of Hercules seem quite trivial.

He conquered the boar of Erymanthus with one hand and has tackled the Hydra of Lerna, which, because it has so many heads, seems to be a kind of bureaucracy. He has a crew of Harvard graduates cleaning out the Augean stables. They seem to be losing ground, as accumulations are increasing, and Bowles may have to do the job himself, after all. But he can do it.

Capturing the Cretan bull was comparatively easy for a man of his attainments, though livestock men and packers cramped his style. When it came to taking away the girdle of Hippolyte, queen of the Amazons, the utmost diplomacy was required, for, after all, the synthetic rubber factories are producing a million tons a year. But he did it.

Seizing the cattle of Geryon and bringing in the apples of Hesperides were right up his alley. If OPA couldn't get 'em, CCC and AAA would.

Capturing the lion of Nemea was mere routine, for all he needed to do was to issue a

directive, like he did to the three little Swiss guys of San Francisco. So also the seizing of the stag of Arcadia, which was done by a court order. Shooting the birds of Stymphalus was simple, for he had a Ph. D. handy with a slide rule and a book of logarithms, to figure out the angle. Capturing the Thracian mares was easy to anyone accustomed to chasing livestock.

Bringing up Cerberus from the infernal regions posed certain unusual problems, but presumably he directed some of his more practical assistants—those who used common sense in their procedure—to go to hell, and they came back with the wild dog, which, in the new environment, is now growing wilder every hour.

Determined now to outdo Hercules and establish an all-out Olympic record, Mr. Bowles proposes to repeal the law of supply and demand, all by himself, single-handed. Ladies and gentlemen! Watch the center ring for the most sensational, amazing and incredible feat ever performed by a human being! Shirtless veterans may occupy the front seats.

The other editorial is entitled "Law of Supply and Demand," and reads as follows:

LAW OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND

Since OPA is trying desperately to maintain its wartime control of prices indefinitely into peacetimes, it is about time to make careful examination of the theory, and determine whether it is safe for any long-time program.

Those who urge the complete abolition of Government price controls, as rapidly as such elimination can be accomplished without undue shock, do not deny that prices, in some cases, would go up.

That would be a disadvantage. It might even produce a temporary inflation. But the real question is whether a failure to do so will not produce still more disastrous results. Our managed inflation is still inflation, without a doubt.

It all goes back to the fact that the law of supply and demand is, and always will be, the most inexorable of all the economic laws, and no amount of artificial Government controls can ultimately defeat it.

In the matter of men's shirts, for instance, there are a million of them held for sale, but they can't be sold because OPA has a fancy theory about making their sale depend upon the sale of a cheaper grade.

If the shirts were thrown on the market without restriction, possibly the price would rise, since customers, for a while, would bid against each other. But the shirt manufacturers would be eager to get in on the good prices, so they would redouble their efforts to produce them. After a while there would be an over-supply, for our modern technology works fast. Then the price would go down again—very likely lower than they are now. We must always remember that under modern technology, prices normally tend to go down, like steel to a magnet. That is the very nature of the process, for it is closely linked with volume production in an interdependent economic chain of factors, under brisk competition.

With the OPA restriction still on, however, the manufacturers won't produce shirts at all, and general paralysis of that industry has set in. Ultimately it will mean drastic scarcity and disaster. OPA is building up to a great fall. The system just won't work. We shall all have to pay through the nose for this folly.

The matter of the 65-cent wage minimum is another illustration.

It's all very fine to say that every laborer should have at least 65 cents an hour. It sounds high-minded and altruistic. But in practical application it won't work because there are certain types of labor for which no one will pay 65 cents an hour. The work will remain undone, or the prospective employer will manage to do it himself. The

40-cent or 25-cent man, who has no skill or training, will be put out of a job and that means disaster, no matter how you look at it. The law of supply and demand must be respected. It will have its way, no matter how many artificial obstacles are put in its way.

This is another agency which is hindering the activities of the people of the country, and therefore delaying reconversion.

Mr. EASTLAND. The agency is very inflationary, because it is costing us production.

Mr. MOORE. It is costing us production, and it is preventing production. Undoubtedly it is one of those things which is intended to discourage enterprise.

Mr. President, I have just read the bill which is under consideration, and it seems to me that it would totally destroy inducement of any kind for any industry to try to function under it. Under the private enterprise system, of course, private industry is operated for profit. I doubt very much whether an employer ever gives any consideration to the color, creed, or nationality of the persons he employs. As I understand, he employs them because they can make some contribution to production, on which private enterprise depends.

I have consistently held, although I have not had very much support in my contention, that the OPA has been a hindrance to production, and is in itself inflationary, because it simply does not permit of a program which will encourage production.

Apropos of some of the objections which are made to the bill under consideration, without considering what may have been the practice of some employers with reference to the employment of members of certain races or creeds, the bill is so destructive of the freedom which is needed in private enterprise that it would practically destroy private enterprise. Whether or not that is the purpose of the bill, it certainly would have that result.

Mr. EASTLAND. Can the Senator doubt that that is the purpose of the bill, when the procedure for punishing an offender, in disregard of the rights of an American citizen, is lifted out of the Russian Code?

Mr. MOORE. I do not believe that there is any serious desire in the minds of Senators to see this bill enacted.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator believe that if there were a secret vote the bill would receive as many as 15 votes?

Mr. MOORE. I have been told by a Senator in whom I have great confidence that if there were a secret ballot it would not receive more than two votes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that be true, if the consciences and hearts of representatives of the people in the Senate are not behind this measure, that means that it is self-evident that the real motive behind the presentation of it to the Senate is wholly and purely political.

Mr. MOORE. Political and deceptive.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator think that?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the statement just made, that not more than 15 Senators would vote for it if the ballot were secret, can be substantiated, that is what it means.

Mr. EASTLAND. What are the Senator's views on that question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not wish to comment on what any other Senator might or might not do, but I feel quite confident that if we could have a secret ballot on the bill it would not receive nearly as many votes as it would if the vote were recorded.

Mr. MOORE. That means that all we are trying to do is to fool someone.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not say that.

Mr. MOORE. I have not said it either. I am only quoting another Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let me put it this way: Every Member of Congress, being human, had some interest in trying to remain in office, unless he is determined not to run again. He may not feel such deep convictions against this measure that he cannot yield to political expediency. But I do say that if the premise is correct—that not more than 15 Senators would vote for it if we had a secret ballot—the only conclusion that can be drawn is that it is a political consideration rather than one of service to the general welfare of the country.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I do not state that I have an opinion about the motives of Senators who support or oppose the bill. I did not state, and I do not now state, that I have any knowledge as to how many Senators would vote for it. I was quoting another Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I take the same position. I do not know, but I say that if that statement can be substantiated, there is but one conclusion to draw.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I take the same position as does the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I do not know the sentiments of all Senators. However, we have all heard the statement. I do not know whether it is correct or not. I know that there are Senators who are sincerely for the bill. I know that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is sincerely for it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And I am not asking the permission of the Senator from Mississippi or the Senator from Oklahoma to be for it. If the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from Oklahoma are so brave and so sure of their position that the bill will be defeated, why do they not give us an opportunity to vote on it? They are afraid. The cowardice is on the side of those who would kill the bill through talk, through the deception of which the Senator from Oklahoma speaks, he not being for the bill. I am for the bill. If the Senator from Oklahoma is so brave and so honest, why does he wait for a secret ballot? Why does he not stand up and tell the world that he is against the bill?

Mr. MOORE. I am against it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am for it.

Mr. MOORE. That is all right.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And I am not asking the permission of the Senator from

Oklahoma or any other Senator to be for it.

Mr. MOORE. I am not impugning the Senator's motives.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the Senator will not let us vote on the bill. He does not dare to let us vote on it, because he knows that there would be more than 15 votes in favor of it.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, we are protecting the Constitution of the United States and the American system of government, and this bill is not going to pass.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator admit that the bill would pass if its opponents would permit us to vote upon it?

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not admit anything. I do not say anything—

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator will not even admit that he is hitting against the Negro.

Mr. EASTLAND. I say that we are justified in doing anything we can to prevent passage of a bill which would destroy the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am becoming tired of being accused of cowardice, lack of patriotism, and such things. I do not take my hat off to any Senator, whether he be from the South or elsewhere.

Mr. EASTLAND. Who has accused the Senator—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Some Senator, unknown to anyone else, told the Senator from Oklahoma that if there were a secret ballot the bill would not receive 15 votes.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did that statement impugn the motives of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I place my own interpretation on the statement, just as the Senator from Mississippi places his own interpretation on the bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I most certainly wish to have the Senator from New Mexico, for whom I have a very high regard, understand that I am not in any way impugning his motives or his sincerity in his beliefs. I have stated very frankly that I think this bill, if enacted, would be a very bad law, just as I think all the other New Deal laws—every one of them—are bad. There has never been any misunderstanding about what my position regarding them has been. I am not saying that I am correct, but those are my views.

I respect the views of the Senator from New Mexico, just as I do the views of all other Senators.

I think this bill would be bad law; therefore I am very strongly against it, just as the Senator from New Mexico is very strongly in favor of it.

In saying that I was told by a Senator that if there was a secret ballot, only a

few Senators would vote in favor of the bill, I did not mean to say that I asked how the Senator would vote. Since I have been in the Senate I have never asked another Senator how he would vote on a bill, and I do not think anyone has asked me. I have appreciated that relationship which has existed between Senators.

I wish to say now that, as many other Senators on both sides of the aisle have contended, I think this issue is political. If there be any who consider it so important that they come back here that they will readily resort to expedients in which they do not believe, I think that is political cowardice. That is nothing new, and I do not charge it.

I have received a great deal of correspondence about this bill, as other Senators have. Those who have written me have stated that they would like me to vote for cloture or limited debate and to vote for this bill. I presume their letters represent somewhat of an organized effort; it looks that way to me. If it is not, then it is spontaneous.

But I judge from the mail which I have received that if I ever seek reelection to the Senate, which I expect to do if I am living at the time when my present term expires, it is possible that I might be defeated because of the stand I take on this bill. What does the Senator from New Mexico think about that? Does that convince him that I am in earnest, regardless of the consequences, and does he blame me if I consider my own conscience and my own responsibility in deciding to vote against a bill which I believe to be contrary to the interests of the people of the United States?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield, so that I may reply to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say that no one impugns the motives or sincerity of the Senator from Oklahoma for doing that, but we are asking for the same respect. I feel that the Senator from Oklahoma is against the bill because he feels, down in his heart, that the bill is wrong.

Mr. MOORE. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is proper for him to oppose the bill if he feels that way about it. But why go so far as to say that it is deceptive if I dare to be for the bill, if the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] dares to be for it, if the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] dares to be for it? Cannot they be just as honest and just as courteous to other Senators as is the Senator from Oklahoma, and must he say that they are attempting to deceive the American people? I do not think the Senator from Kansas or the Senator from Vermont need to advocate this bill in order to be reelected. The Senator from Oklahoma might.

The Senator from New Mexico might.

Mr. MOORE. I would not know about that, and I would not be concerned.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not concerned, either. But I maintain that the 48 Senators who signed the petition for cloture have a right to know what this body is going to do about it. Those Senators are not only from this side of the aisle. Twenty-four of them are from the Sen-

ator's side, and they dared to sign the cloture petition. That does not necessarily mean that they will vote for cloture, of course.

Mr. MOORE. What would the Senator think if I were to tell him that some Senators who signed the cloture petition intended to vote against the bill?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know about that, and I am not interested in any way in what Senators on the other side of the aisle will do. I know they are likely to do anything. But the fact remains that 24 of them signed the cloture petition.

Mr. MOORE. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that some who signed it are against the bill, and that is all right. But does not the Senator think that, inasmuch as they intend to vote against cloture, some opportunity should be given to them to vote against it if they wish to do so?

Mr. MOORE. That I am not able to answer. Of course, the rule requiring a two-thirds vote in favor of cloture before it can be invoked was adopted before I came to the Senate. If I had been here when the Senate was asked to adopt the rule, I would have voted against it, because I have advocated and I still advocate unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let us go further. There is no question that, possibly, there are some political implications connected with the bill.

Mr. MOORE. Possibly?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; possibly. When the Senator voted to lower the taxes on corporations, he knew there was politics in that, too.

Mr. MOORE. What is that?

Mr. CHAVEZ. When some Senators voted last fall to lower the taxes on corporations after the first of the year, they also knew there was politics in that.

Mr. MOORE. I thought that was a matter of self-preservation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, certainly; so long as you do not give some poor human beings, some Negroes, more than \$15 a month and a side of pork, it is self-preservation. But will you try to get them a job? Will you try to give them an opportunity to enjoy the American way of life? Will you try to see that they are able to obtain medicine and food for their families? Oh, no; it is said that that is un-American and wrong.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to wait right there. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico is now talking about the wage scale of Negroes in the South. I have stated on this floor today, and I repeat it, that the wage scale for cotton pickers in the cotton fields of the South is higher than the wage scale for Negroes in the State of Pennsylvania; in fact, it is the highest wage scale in America today, and I defy the Senator from New Mexico or anyone else to refute that statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. How much is it?

Mr. EASTLAND. It is \$3 a hundred for picking cotton. I challenge anyone to refute that statement.

Some say the opposition to this bill is a fight against wages. Mr. President,

that is not so. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GURFEY] today put his finger on the spot when he said the purpose of the bill was to tear down partitions between rest rooms for white people and rest rooms for Negroes, and to create social equality.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the groups in certain cotton sections of the South meet and determine, themselves, in the American way, the price per hundred pounds for picking cotton?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not also a fact that those groups consistently, since 1932, have raised the price for picking cotton from, in some instances, 30 or 40 cents a hundred pounds to as much as \$4?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly. Many of those who advocate the passage of this bill state that they are trying to increase the wages of the poor downtrodden tenant-farmer southern Negroes. But, Mr. President, without this bill, without such Marxist measures as this, the southern Negroes who pick cotton have the highest wage scale in America.

Mr. MAYBANK. And is it not also a fact that in the South many of the colored people own their own farms, on which they produce about half of the total amount of cotton grown in the South?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not also a fact that the OPA wishes to have a ceiling placed on cotton, a large proportion of which is raised by the colored people of the South?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes—in order to benefit Sidney Hillman's union.

Mr. MAYBANK. In order to benefit a few people in New York. That is the fact.

Mr. EASTLAND. Now, Mr. President, I continue with a synopsis of procedure in the Soviet Union in criminal cases:

The court decides whether the trial will take place with the participation of attorneys for the prosecution and for the defense, or the case may be determined by the court alone.

In other words, in Russia the judge or the presiding officer of the court, whose duty it is to carry out the policies of the State, and who is merely an agent of the executive power, decides whether a defendant may have a lawyer. In that particular, this bill protects the rights of an accused, because under the bill an accused is entitled to have an attorney to defend him. But what do those rights avail him when he goes to a court which is "packed" against him and which is bent upon a legal lynching?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment, I should like to refer once more to the cotton situation, so that there may be no misunderstanding and so that some of those who would destroy the income of the colored people of the South and who have consistently worked in the interest of the North, particularly New York, may

know the actual situation. I ask this question: In speaking of the price of cotton, is it not a fact that the cost of laundering a shirt in the city of Washington or in the city of New York is more than the cost of all the cotton that is in the shirt?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the price of cotton has but very little to do with the total cost of garments which the poor people must wear?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is exactly correct. But, Mr. President, I am tired of hearing appeals to prejudice, and statements being made that some of us are attempting to keep down the southern Negro. Last fall I paid Negro cotton pickers \$10 a day, and furnished them with a house and a garden. Where else in America could a Negro make as much money, and where else in America could he obtain such a standard of living?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has spoken of colored cotton pickers. Is it not a fact that almost half the cotton pickers in the South are white persons?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes; and they vote. I suppose that eventually someone will accuse us of attempting to take that right away from them.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not the Senator's belief that the proper thing to do is to help increase the price of cotton, tobacco, corn, and other agricultural products which are raised on the farms operated by both colored and white farmers?

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. And does not the Senator believe that it is important to readjust southern freight rates so that all the business of the country will not be centered in the East?

Mr. EASTLAND. When the present economic discriminations against the South are removed, the welfare of all the people of the South will be greatly improved.

Mr. President, I continue reading from the synopsis of the Russian system of jurisprudence, in showing that we are asked to follow a similar system in Senate bill 101:

The admittance of one of the other witnesses proposed by the counsel for the defense or prosecution lies within the discretion of the court.

Under the pending bill the accused would have a right to call witnesses, and that right would be in accordance with the American system. However, the Commission would have authority to hold a hearing 3,000 miles away from the home of the accused, and force him to take his witnesses that far away from their homes. No provision is made in the bill to pay for the transportation of the accused or his witnesses, or pay his expenses in any form. Therefore, Mr. President, what is the right which the accused may have under the terms of the bill worth to him or to any other citizen of this country?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The very circumstances which the Senator has described,

including the manner in which the alleged defendant may be forced to travel from one State to another, makes the bill a most vicious one. Would not the exercise of the power to be given to the Commission result in intimidation itself? How many small businessmen faced with charges under the terms of the bill could possibly bear the expense of defending themselves, however innocent they might be of the charges which had been made against them.

Mr. EASTLAND. There would be only one thing for them to do, namely, yield to the Commission.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, the Senator agrees with me that the accused would be compelled to yield to whatever the inspector or the investigator told him he should do, or what he ordered him to do.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And upon his failure to do what he had been told to do, he could be subjected to the expense to which the Senator has referred, harassment, and other punishment which might eventually put him out of business.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I read further from the synopsis of the Russian code:

The witnesses that are summoned are the witnesses which the court deems necessary and defendant does not have the right to have his witnesses summoned except by permission of the court.

Mr. President, that is very similar to the system proposed by the pending bill.

Any statement or document gained during the judicial investigation is admissible in evidence against the accused provided there are serious obstacles for bringing the witness to court, to that extent the right of cross-examination is denied.

Mr. President, that is the same system that we find established in the FEPC bill. Any statement may be admitted in evidence by the Commission. Hearsay testimony may be admitted in evidence. An affidavit may be admitted in evidence. Within the discretion of the Commission the accused may be denied the right to face his accusers, or the witnesses who testify against him. He may be denied the right of cross-examination. That is exactly the system which prevails in Communist Russia today.

I read further from the synopsis of the Russian code:

Any statement or document gained during the judicial investigation is admissible in evidence against the accused.

I had already read that language, but I wish to emphasize it. Is not the effect of the language similar to the effect of the provisions of the pending bill? Is there any doubt that any statement, any document, or any record which has been gained by the first investigator would be admissible in evidence against a person who had been accused. There can be utterly no doubt about it, and such a system rapes elemental rules of American justice. Why, Mr. President, has it been necessary for us to go to Russia and take her criminal procedure as an example to follow in a bill such as the one now pending before the Senate,

which would give a Commission vast powers over American business?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know what the procedure is in the common-law States, but Louisiana is a civil-law State, as the Senator knows.

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. In order to obtain a document in the possession of one's adversary it is absolutely necessary that the party desiring the production of the document shall go into court with a verified petition—

Mr. EASTLAND. And obtain a court order.

Mr. OVERTON. The petition must describe the document and what is expected to be proved by it. It must also show that the evidence to be obtained would be competent and material. That is what we call a subpoena duces tecum.

Mr. EASTLAND. We call it such in the common-law States, including Mississippi.

Mr. OVERTON. Yes. Under the pending bill the FEPC representative could enter a man's place of business, ransack his books and papers, take copies of whatever he pleased, and walk out as though he were the Czar of all the Russians.

Mr. EASTLAND. And if the accused were to refuse to give the investigator free access to his books and records he would be subject to an indictment and a sentence of \$5,000, or a year in jail, or both. In the pending bill there has been embodied the Russian system whereby an investigating agent could obtain all the documents which he desired to get into his possession, and such documents would be considered as being competent evidence against the accused.

Mr. OVERTON. I think that the power sought to be granted in the pending bill would be much more drastic than the power given by the Russian Code. At least that is my impression from what I have learned while the Senator was reading. The Russian Code provisions are somewhat more liberal than are the provisions of this bill, so far as the party under investigation is concerned.

Mr. EASTLAND. From what I understand about it, the practice in Russia is about the same as the practice which is provided for under this bill. For example, in Russia an accused is not required to give evidence against himself. Yet an investigating officer may swear him, put him on the witness stand, make him testify, and then set his testimony up in an indictment which may be used against him.

Mr. President, I read from a translation of section 57 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of Russia, and I ask Senators to listen carefully to it:

The court shall not be limited to any formal rules of evidence and it shall be discretionary with the court to admit in accordance with the circumstances of the case one or other pieces of evidence or to request such from a third party for whom such request is mandatory.

The court shall not be limited by any formal rules of evidence.

Mr. President, is that in the FEPC bill? The Commission can set up its own rules of procedure, and is the sole judge of what it shall admit in evidence.

Mr. President, rule 57 of the Communist Code is in the bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The bill does not even require that the accused shall be confronted by his accuser, does it?

Mr. EASTLAND. No.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It does not provide him the right of cross-examination of those who accuse him?

Mr. EASTLAND. No. In that regard it is more drastic than the practice in Russia. Under the practice in Russia a witness is first interrogated by the trial judge. When the judge gets through, then the prosecuting attorney or the defense attorney asks the judge questions, and requests the judge to ask those questions of the witness. The trial judge, or the trial officer—he is not a judge—is subject to reversal by a superior court.

Mr. President, that is not the practice proposed under the bill. The Commission is not to be subject to reversal if any evidence, be it proper or not, would sustain its findings. In that particular the proposed system is much more drastic than the system in vogue in Russia.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Under the provisions of the bill there is not the same requirement even for preponderance of evidence that is required in civil cases in this country before a judgment can be rendered against a man for money consideration.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Whereas in the criminal jurisprudence of our land the requirement is that the evidence must convince beyond a reasonable doubt before a man can be convicted of a crime.

Mr. EASTLAND. There is no presumption of innocence in Russia, and there is no presumption of innocence in Senate bill 101.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The only burden the bill places upon the accuser, or the Commission, is that some evidence—it says "any evidence," and some evidence would be any evidence—some evidence of discrimination shall be produced.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator would not take the position, would he, that under the bill evidence necessary to support a judgment would have to be competent and admissible in court?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The bill does not provide that, and therefore it does not contain such a requirement. I point out further to the Senator that under the provisions of the bill the evidence is not required to be sworn to. However, it might be evidence by which the courts would be bound, if it appeared in the record. It might be in the form of ex parte affidavits; it might be in the form of a telegram or a written letter; it might be

anything, if it made some kind of a charge.

Mr. EASTLAND. This is from the Russian Code:

Oath as an evidence shall not be admitted.

In Russia witnesses are not sworn, and are not permitted to be sworn. Our law provides, as the Senator knows, that witnesses must be sworn. Under the bill there is no provision for swearing a witness before he is competent to testify. Does the Senator think we are following the Communist procedure here?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senator will yield, under the bill even the person making the accusation is not required to do so under oath, nor at any time after having made it must he substantiate it under oath.

Mr. EASTLAND. And it is not necessary, under the bill, that there be probable cause shown before the complaint is approved and the defendant summoned to defend himself.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is in the bill no provision, such as is embodied in our present penal code, that protects an individual from false and malicious prosecution. There is no provision in the bill which protects a citizen. In other words, if a small businessman in Mississippi were accused of discrimination, he would be brought to Washington, finally brought before the Commission, and put to the expense necessary finally to defend himself and protect himself against the fallacious charges brought against him, and no matter how much expense he incurred and how much inconvenience and loss of time and other harassment he suffered, he would have no remedy against his accusers.

Mr. EASTLAND. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator to the sixth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which reads as follows:

In all criminal prosecution, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and District wherein the crime shall have been committed.

Does the Senator think that under the pending bill the accused would be entitled to a speedy and public trial? Of course, he would not be. Nor is an accused person in Russia entitled to a speedy and public trial.

I read further from the sixth amendment:

Which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation.

That is not required under the bill.

To be confronted with the witnesses against him.

That constitutional right is taken from the citizen.

To have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor.

Mr. President, does not the Senator from Arkansas realize that in matters over which the FEPC has jurisdiction the accused does not have the right of compulsory process to bring witnesses to testify in his behalf?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Arkansas does realize it,

and I realize many other imperfections of the bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. Did the Senator know that in Soviet Russia there is not the right of compulsory process?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not so familiar with the procedure in Russia, but I am being enlightened by the very able address the Senator is making. I am very much interested in the comparisons he is making. Of course, we all know—I say we all know; it would be conceded by me, at least—that the bill contravenes all principles of the American Government which have existed up to this time, and any comparison with the Russian system is very enlightening indeed. I cannot see how the bill can have the support of those who love liberty, if they really appreciate what the consequences of it will be. If the bill shall be enacted, the liberty and the majesty of American citizens, as such, will simply be destroyed.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. I wonder why the bill did not go to the Committee on the Judiciary. That committee was certainly the proper one to which the bill should have been referred. As the Senator knows, the Judiciary Committee is composed of lawyers, who would have realized that the bill proposed to abandon the American system of justice. A monstrosity would not have been brought up before the Senate substituting Russian criminal procedure for the American court system.

Only yesterday, when several provisions of the bill, as compared with the Russian Code, were read, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] who is very much in favor of the bill, took the floor and said at least one of the provisions should by all means be changed. Such a monstrosity would never have gotten out of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Since the debate started there have been so many such admissions with reference to the different provisions of the bill, by those who profess to be favoring the enactment of an FEPC bill, that if all of them were acted on there would not be any of the provisions of the bill left.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. President, let me return to the Russian Criminal Code. Listen to this from the synopsis:

Thus there are no rules for the admission of evidence but anyone is competent, hearsay, etc., within the discretion of the court.

Under the bill hearsay is competent, anything is competent within the discretion of a trial examiner who himself is not a lawyer, as in Russia the judge is not a lawyer.

Mr. President, let us go further in respect to the criminal procedure in Russia:

The decisions of the court are made by majority vote.

In Russia the decisions of the court are by majority vote. A man is not convicted by the unanimous decision of 12

of his peers, as is the practice in this country, but in Russia it is by majority vote. In Russia the court is composed of a trial examiner and two other individuals who are summoned to serve. Under the FEPC bill the accused would be convicted by a majority vote, just exactly as is the practice in Soviet Russia, the only difference being that in Russia only three individuals sit in judgment, while under the present FEPC bill a Commission of five would sit in Washington, and decide.

The system provided in the bill is even weaker than the Russian system, because the three men who sit as a court under the Russian system see the witnesses, hear the testimony of the witnesses, observe their facial expressions, and are in a better position to judge the truth or the falsity of the testimony and to reach a just and correct verdict than a board which does not see and hear the witnesses. Under the FEPC bill the record would be transmitted several thousand miles to the city of Washington, and, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] so well pointed out, the Commission in many instances—I will say in most instances, Mr. President—will not actually examine that record and reach a decision, but the decision will be reached by a bureaucrat, by an underling. I submit that all too often that is the system which is in vogue in this city today.

Mr. President, let us go further with the synopsis of the Russian system:

Witnesses are interrogated by the court. After the court is finished, then the attorney for the accused or the prosecutor can request the court to ask the witnesses specific questions, and this is a matter within the discretion of the court.

There Mr. President, we have the same system as would be created by this bill. The witnesses, under the provisions of the bill, can request the trial examiner to be permitted to ask some questions, and it is within his discretion whether he will permit that to be done. That is the same as the Russian system. But that, Mr. President, is not the same as the American court system; it is not the same as the great system which safeguards the liberties of the American people. That is a right which is swept away, which is destroyed, which is gone, and it is swept away in order to give minorities preference in employment over men who have suffered and shed their blood for their country.

I read further from the synopsis of the Soviet system:

In the Soviet Union no court warrant is required for an arrest.

Is not that true under the provisions of the bill? Is a warrant required under its provisions when a man is cited before the Commission by whose decision he can be deprived of his liberty? Are we not still further tracking the system in vogue in Communist Russia at the present time?

The constitution—

By that is meant the Constitution of the Soviet Union—

states merely that any arrest must be approved by the prosecuting attorney.

That is the system provided in the bill. The citation of an accused under the bill must be approved by the Fair Employment Practice Commission. Under our American court system a warrant must be issued, there must be a judicial determination, probable cause must be shown. Under our court system an individual is guaranteed against arrest on frivolous grounds. Those are sacred rights guaranteed to the American citizen. An American citizen under our law cannot be deprived of his liberty except on probable cause shown, unless there is an adjudication before a judicial officer. But in Russia, oh no, the prosecuting attorney must approve before an arrest, just exactly as is provided in the present FEPC bill, under the terms of which the Fair Employment Practice Commission must approve the citation, when a man is cited without a warrant.

INVESTIGATION OF STARVATION CONDITIONS IN EUROPE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me so that I may place something in the Record, if by doing so he will not lose the floor?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield if I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. On January 29 I spoke in the Senate, at which time I made a detailed report of the food conditions in Europe, particularly in the American occupied zone. I spoke of the starvation policy to which apparently we, either knowingly or unknowingly, have subscribed. At the same time I submitted a concurrent resolution in my own behalf and in behalf of other Members of the Senate, which calls for the appointment by the President pro tempore of the Senate of six members of a nonpartisan congressional committee, three members from the Democratic side and three members from the Republican side of the Senate, a like number to be appointed in the House, to go immediately to our occupied zone in Germany, as well as into all other zones where the committee could take evidence, and conduct an investigation on the ground in an attempt to investigate the truthfulness of the reports which are filtering through and determine the correctness of allegations, some of which have been made by individuals in high places in our Government, as well as by leaders of charitable organizations, and by others. The proposed committee would determine whether such reports are to be taken at face value or whether they should be discounted. In other words, the committee would make an impartial report as to conditions prevailing not only in our occupied zone in Germany but in any other zone which the committee might be able to visit and in which it could take direct testimony relative to the food situation, the housing situation, and the clothing situation.

My resolution, Mr. President, was based upon the precedent of the congressional investigating committee which was sent to Europe to investigate the atrocities committed in the political prisoner camps. I am quite sure that the distinguished occupant of the chair will agree

with me that that committee was non-partisan in character, that it was composed of the same number as I have suggested in my resolution, and that the committee made a unanimous report which was accepted by Congress and, I am satisfied, was accepted by the people of America as presenting not only the viewpoint of the committee whose members were eyewitnesses to the atrocities but also correctly reflected the evidence which was adduced in the investigations conducted by the committee. The distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], made that report. It was a long, detailed report, and I believe the President pro tempore will remember that there was no dissenting voice to any of the provisions of the report.

Mr. President, the members of the committee were high in their praise of the report made by the majority leader. I happened to be a member of that investigating committee, and because I believed that that committee did such able work, that it was nonpartisan in character, and brought back correct information relative to atrocities, I think it proper that a similar committee be appointed to investigate the situation now existing in Europe relating to food, clothing, and housing during the remainder of the winter.

Mr. President, time is the essence of this matter. We are now into the middle of February. In a few more days February will have passed. If we are to make any recommendations respecting one of the provisions of the resolution, which is to open up the mails so that charitable institutions in this country may use the mails in collecting money, food, clothing, and medicine, which must, of course, be transmitted across the ocean to those who need help, action must be taken quickly, because, as I said, time is of the essence.

Mr. President, we have listened today to the able address made by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] in which he dwelt upon the philosophy of Russia. He was a member of another committee which investigated conditions in Europe. That committee rendered excellent service, and submitted a valuable report to Congress.

As the Senator was speaking respecting the Russian philosophy, I thought that, if possible, the proposed committee should go into the Russian zone; that it should not only investigate conditions in our own zone but in the Russian zone to ascertain what are the conditions there. I say that because there was handed to me today by one high in the military service a report which I now hold in my hand. I am not permitted to mention his name. We receive our information in ways similar to this. We ourselves cannot secure direct information. We have no way of subpoenaing witnesses. Congress does not have under its jurisdiction personnel which it can send overseas to make investigations. Such investigations must be authorized by congressional resolution. If the allegations contained in the report which was handed me by the Army official to whom I referred are true, they certainly bear out the detailed report which I sub-

mitted on the floor of the Senate a few days ago relative to the charges which are made as to conditions in our own military occupied zone and in other zones.

Mr. President, this report is dated December 4, 1945, and is entitled "Eyewitness Reports From Russian and Polish-controlled Territories." It states:

From a large number of reports, a few have been selected to give a picture of (a) the transport of evacuees through Polish and Russian-controlled territories—

The very territory we are talking about today—

(b) conditions within the refugee camps in the Russian zone; and (c) the situation existing in those parts of the Russian zone to which the stream of refugees has been directed.

The reports which are coming in are to the effect that thousands upon thousands of refugees are crowding into the American-occupied zone because of conditions which are worse outside the American-occupied zone. This particular report is entitled, "New Wave of Evacuation From Breslau. Eyewitness Report of a Prominent Clergyman."

The report states graphically what the condition is in that particular locality:

A new wave of evacuation of the German population from Breslau has been going on for the past 2 weeks. At present the number of Germans in Breslau is not more than 160,000, as compared with a Polish population of 60,000. In September, the number of Germans in Breslau was reported as 200,000.

The official expulsion order covers the following groups of the city's German population:

1. All able-bodied unemployed.
2. All women with small children, unavailable for labor.
3. Old and sick, insofar as they are able to travel.
4. Those cleaning up the streets, insofar as their work is not regarded as vital.

The block leaders have to list all Germans who fall within these designated groups. Using their list as a guide, the expulsions are carried out in such a manner that those arrested have to leave their homes within half an hour. They have to line up on the street, are then picked up and taken, under guard, to the "Stadthafen" freight depot, where they are loaded into unheated freight cars and shipped west in the direction of the Russian-Polish border via the towns of Oberrhein, Rawitsch, Glogau, and Forst.

In this way, 40,000 to 60,000 Germans are being removed from Breslau. These evacuation measures seem especially inhuman, as most persons belonging to groups 2 and 3, and also some in group 1 are dependent on outside aid in order to move out of the city. As such assistance is not available, it can be stated without exaggeration that for many, especially the children, old and sick, the forthcoming expulsion means certain death.

They are subject to evacuation from that particular zone, and when they are evacuated they are started westward. They finally wind up in the American zone, where we are not feeding German nationals through UNRRA or any other agency that I know of, except for some feeding by the United States Army.

The report proceeds to tell about the eye-witness testimony of the clergyman from Breslau, as I have already stated. The second part has to do with the refugee camp southeast of Berlin. The name of the camp is Cottbus. It is in the Russian zone.

REFUGEE CAMP, ANNABERGSTRASSE, COTTBUS, IN THE RUSSIAN ZONE, SOUTHEAST OF BERLIN

This report was rendered by an objective anti-Nazi official of one of the large Berlin banks, who made a special investigation of conditions in the Cottbus camp; the 65-mile rail journey, Berlin-Cottbus, which in normal times took two hours, required 15 hours.

He goes into detail about the camp. Conditions are almost identical with the conditions we found in the political prisoner camps when I was over there.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am much interested, and I think the Senator from Nebraska should read the entire report. I agree with him. I believe that there is a conspiracy of silence to prevent the American people from knowing the terrible effect, in starvation and human misery, which our policies are having in Europe. I believe we have engaged in a policy of race extermination, to exterminate a race of people who are very similar to our own. I feel that the distinguished Senator should by all means read the report in full.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for the contribution which he has made, and also for the invitation to read the report into the Record. I did not want the Senator to feel that I was taking his time. I did not wish to interfere at this point in his speech.

Mr. EASTLAND. I have plenty of time.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator made reference to the situation in Russia. A portion of the report deals with the Russian zone.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator. I have plenty of time and plenty to say; but I believe that as a matter of public service the distinguished Senator should read the entire report for the benefit of the Senate and the country.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. With the consent of the Senator, I shall be glad to read the report into the Record at this point.

Mr. EASTLAND. Provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I will accept the floor on that basis, and not ask the Senator to yield for any other purpose.

Mr. President, I was speaking about the report of the bank official of Berlin, who was an anti-Nazi. He made an investigation of the camp at Cottbus, in Russian-occupied territory in Germany.

The report continues:

The refugee camp in Cottbus is situated on the eastern outskirts of the city; it consists of 20 barracks and covers an area 300 by 600 feet. The condition of the camp is very bad; the impression is one of complete demoralization. In most of the barracks there are no windows. The barracks cannot be heated, except for the hospital barracks, as there are neither stoves nor fuel available. There is no electricity, as the lines were damaged and have not yet been repaired.

The most necessary fixtures, such as beds, wardrobes, tables and benches, are missing. The refugees, with their children, have to live eat, and sleep on the floors. The small amount of straw available has been used so much that it has become matted and hard. It is pitiful to see fathers beg the camp director in vain, for coal to prevent their children from freezing to death.

Bathing installations are broken and the delousing facilities of the camp cannot be used, due to lack of coal. As a result, there is no delousing. When entering the camp, the evacuees receive no inoculations against contagious diseases.

The suffering of the evacuees is indescribable. Driven out by Polish soldiers and militia, they had to leave their houses and farms in Polish-controlled territory, often on less than 1 hour's notice. They are allowed to take with them only the barest essentials of clothes and foodstuffs. Their papers are taken from them and their baggage is ransacked—everything of value is taken. Sometimes they have to walk all day to the Polish-Russian border and then remain standing all night while their baggage is searched. Children fall down from exhaustion and go to sleep in the mud. Transportation by train through Polish-controlled territory seems to be the exception.

The crossing of the evacuees from Polish-controlled into Russian-controlled territory, takes place over the Oder and Neisse bridges primarily at Frankfurt on Oder, Fuerstenberg, Guben, Forst, and Goerlitz. Having arrived on the Russian side, the refugees shift for themselves, trying to get into camps. In the Cottbus camp, the refugees arrive almost alone or in groups up to 200 people.

That is one thing that has been contended all the way through the reports which I have received. It is the Russian policy to move into Poland and the occupied parts of Germany and move the population off the land. The Russians take possession, and the refugees must seek food, clothing, and shelter for themselves.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is exactly correct. However, the men are taken to Russia and enslaved.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Women and helpless little children are turned out onto the highways in the dead of winter.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator know that that is the policy which our own Government agreed to at Potsdam?

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the distinguished Senator I will say that that is the agreement which we entered into at Potsdam; and unless we do something about it, we are certainly subscribing to it 100 percent.

Mr. EASTLAND. This is the first time in the Christian era that the doctrine of human slavery has been recognized as applying to the white race.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I thank the distinguished Senator for his remarks. They are very timely. It is certainly time for a committee to go over there and investigate the conditions. As I previously stated, if such conditions are revealed, we ought to have the right to go into Russian territory and make an investigation, because we signed the Potsdam agreement, and the Allied Control Commission certainly ought to have the right to know what is being done in Russian territory, so long as we subscribe to Russia having permission to know what is being done in our own American-occupied zone.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe that his resolution should be amended so as to include an investigation of the whole Potsdam agreement and the effect which such agreement will

have on the economy and prosperity of the United States?

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator for asking me that question. I am now convinced that amendments should be made. When I submitted the resolution it was primarily from the humanitarian point of view, but after submitting the resolution and studying the reports in detail I decided that it would be necessary for the committee to make a complete investigation as to the policies which we are now following under the Allied Control Commission because of the fact that such policies are based upon the theory of the so-called Morgenthau plan. If we are to carry that plan out to the limit and completely deindustrialize Germany as is being done today, blowing up industry after industry under the theory that the Germans should not be permitted to become an industrial nation, we are not going to cure the vacuum in Europe. We shall be creating a further vacuum. Certainly that plan, if carried out to the extreme, would have a vital effect not only on the peace of Europe but the peace of the world.

Mr. EASTLAND. I was informed by representatives of the State Department that there was a plan, to which our Government was a party, to dismantle the German textile industry and give it to Russia as reparations.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. If that had been done, it would have cost this country a permanent market for 2,000,000 bales of American cotton.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. The industry would be dismantled with the approval of underlings in the State Department, persons who are appointed by God only knows whom, and responsible to no one. Their decision would be very detrimental to the interests of the American people. Under the present system there is no way for our people to know what is happening over there. There is no way by which they can know, before the order is issued, what industries will be dismantled. The people in this country who are injured have no means of protesting or having a hearing, or having the matter adjudicated.

While the Potsdam agreements are in the nature of a treaty, they do not come to the United States Senate. What is being done is being done by irresponsible men in the State Department. I submit that the whole system is wrong. When we are confronted with a peace treaty these things will already have been accomplished in Europe. I use the cotton textile industry merely as an illustration to show that permanent damage would be done to the economy of our own country if such a plan were adopted. It was not carried into effect because of the activities of southern Senators. But similar things are happening in respect to other industries in this country, which, in my judgment, are just as vitally affected. I believe that the whole question should be investigated. Machinery should be set up whereby the people of this country who are interested and who will suffer by the acts of the State Department will have a right to be heard and will have a

right to have the matter determined. If we are to protect the interests of the American people it is necessary to do that. I think the distinguished Senator's resolution should be adopted, but I think before being adopted it should be amended so as to include provision for an investigation of the whole Potsdam set-up. It seems to me that the welfare of our people requires that that be done.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, once again I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for his contribution, and I wish to tell him that I shall be very happy to support such an amendment because I feel that the resolution should be broadened so as to provide for an investigation of the whole problem of our policies in Europe, and I think the time to do it is now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. With the permission of the Senator from Mississippi, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. I think there is merit in the resolution as outlined by the Senator from Nebraska. However, it appears to me that it should be extended in scope. Why confine the investigation to Europe? Why should not we be interested in conditions in the islands of the Pacific which have cost so much American blood and so many American lives? Why not investigate the agreements, if any, which we made with Dutch imperialists in Java or with the French in Indochina, or in respect to Arabia or elsewhere, or which we made with the British in regard to Egypt or Palestine? So long as we are going to investigate, I think we should investigate the complete situation, so as to find out where we stand.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his suggestion. Once again I say I shall be heartily in favor of amending the resolution in the manner suggested. I shall support such an amendment if it is offered, and I shall be glad to offer one myself if no other Senator does. I would have the resolution amended so as to include not only an investigation of conditions in Europe, but also an investigation of our policy as to diet and our other policies in respect to the various other conquered areas, as has been advocated by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator believe that inasmuch as the matter is important, he should plead with the Senator from Mississippi to let us vote on Senate bill 101, so that we may thereafter proceed to provide for an investigation of conditions throughout the world?

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the suggestion. As one who signed the petition for cloture, I should be glad to do so.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as I said yesterday, it took 7 years of bloody revolution to set the American people free. It took several years of experience under the Articles of Confederation to gain the knowledge needed to enable our forefathers to draw up the Constitution of the United States. The process of drafting the Constitution at the Convention required many months. The total period was well over 10 years, beginning with

the Revolutionary War. So I do not think we should permit this country to be destroyed after just a few weeks of debate. I think the debate should by all means run as long as the Revolutionary War, as long as the whole process by which the United States was created. I think it is imperative that we do not surrender the liberties of this country in less time than it took to create them.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I am sure the Senator has in mind that it took almost 600 years from Magna Carta to reach the Declaration of Independence. Is the Senator suggesting that length of debate?

Mr. EASTLAND. That length of debate would suit me fine. I have a little boy who is just a year old. The other day I took him to the Senate barber shop and had his hair cut. It would suit me to have this debate run on until he gets into the Senate under his own power. He has been to the Senate barber shop; he knows about that now and he knows his way around. When he becomes a Member of the Senate, under his own power, I think we should still be debating this bill, if it is necessary to debate it that long in order to kill it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the colloquy which has taken place, especially as it has related to suggestions about broadening the scope of the resolution, because I sincerely believe the Senate should take action on the resolution immediately and that the committee provided for by the resolution should be constituted at once, so that it may begin its investigation of conditions in any area in Europe, in any area in the Pacific, or wherever it might be directed to go. I think the committee should bring back to the Congress of the United States an impartial report which would be the means of guiding the Congress in respect to immediate action to relieve the situation of the starving people in Europe and in other theaters of war.

The policies involved are ones to which we subscribe because we signed the Potsdam agreement. Regardless of whether those policies apply only in the German zone occupied by American troops or whether they apply in other zones, if we are operating under an Allied Commission we are giving our sanction to the application of those policies—policies which we ourselves went to war to eliminate and eradicate because we regarded them as injustices perpetrated upon the human race.

After the resolution was submitted last week the newspapers of the next day carried a report from Gen. Lucius Clay that the people concerned were getting along satisfactorily and that the reports were exaggerated.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me at this point, let me state that, from what I know of General Clay's position about this whole matter, it seems there was an attempt to "pull a fast one" on the American people. I doubt that General Clay gave such a statement to the newspapers, be-

cause it is so much at variance with what I know his position to be and with what we know to be the conditions which exist today in central Europe.

Mr. WHERRY. Not only is it at variance with what the Senator knows about those conditions, on the basis of information from reliable sources, but I should like to ask the Senator if his information is not based on an authentic statement made by one high in the military service. I refer to a statement to the effect that the people in Europe will starve this winter and that the diet we are feeding those for whom we are responsible is so limited in caloric content that the people will have to lie in bed and that such a diet is causing starvation in the European zone.

Mr. EASTLAND. We have received information that 1,500 calories a day are so insufficient that the people fed such a diet are practically compelled to stay in bed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. We are also informed that such a diet is so insufficient that the disease ratio has increased and that there is a 50-percent infant mortality rate in Berlin due to the malnutrition of the mothers.

Mr. President, I will ask a question of General Clay, and I hope the newspapers will carry what I say. I wish General Clay would state whether he favors a diet of 2,000 calories for the German people and whether he recommended such a diet to those in authority. I say frankly that I do not think he has kept faith with the people of this country when he has taken issue with the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator once again. I should like to propound this inquiry to the Senator: Is it not also a fact that from the same source from which we obtained the information upon which we both base the premise that insufficient calories are being fed the German people in the zone occupied by American troops, reports have also come, within 24 hours from the time when that information was obtained, that the calories fed to German nationals in the French zone have decreased to 1,100 a day a person. Is that correct?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is correct. From the same high, reliable source I also understood, as did the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, that the French had requested this country to supplement the diet in that area.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; and let me say that I also understood that it was stated that if we could not supplement it, they could not help themselves, and that for the remainder of the winter they would not be able to maintain a diet of even 1,100 calories a day for the German nationals in their zone. Does the Senator understand that I have correctly stated the information we have received?

Mr. EASTLAND. That is entirely correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

So, Mr. President, that seems to entirely refute the statement made by General Clay.

As the Senator from Mississippi said, it seems impossible that General Clay made such a statement, in view of the information the Senator from Mississippi and I have received regarding conditions not only in the American-occupied zone but in other zones.

Mr. EASTLAND. And also in view of the information which other Senators have received from the same source.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. President, I understand that the Foreign Relations Committee is to meet tomorrow to consider some resolutions and other matters which are now before it. I sincerely request the Foreign Relations Committee immediately to consider this resolution and report it to the Senate, so that within the next few hours we may have a congressional delegation on the way to Europe to make an impartial investigation, to the end that, right on the ground, all sources of information may be consulted and a dependable report brought back to the Congress of the United States. It will be a dependable report if we have that kind of congressional committee making that kind of an investigation not only in our zone but in every other zone it can get into in Europe and also, if necessary, in the Southwest Pacific, as well.

Mr. President, I continue to read the report which the distinguished Senator from Mississippi requested that I place in the Record at this point. I was talking about Camp Cottbus, which is 85 miles from Berlin, and is in the Russian-occupied zone, and I had stated that farmers comprise the largest group of evacuees:

Farmers comprise the largest group of the evacuees. There are also manual laborers of every type, tradesmen, officials, bargemen, and so forth, with their families. The absence of intellectuals, with the exception of a few teachers, is noticeable.

Generally the refugees stay in the camp from 8 to 14 days until a large enough group has collected. Then, in groups of from 400 to 600, they are shipped on by train. At the time set by the camp leader, the evacuees gather at the station with their baggage. They often have to wait one or two days around the destroyed station buildings until the Russians give the permit for the trip.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may ask unanimous consent that the "boys" who have been participating in the filibuster be delegated to go to Europe and that they leave tomorrow? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator repeat his request?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if the Senator will be kind enough to yield to me in order that I may ask unanimous consent that the "boys" who have been participating in the filibuster be delegated to go to Europe, and that they leave tomorrow. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I object to any such unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hesitated in submitting the report because I thought that possibly the proponents of the FEPC bill might feel that I was delaying a vote on cloture. I merely asked permission to invite the attention of the Senate to the headlines, and to place the report in the Record. But I was reading from the report at the suggestion and at

the instance of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who was one of the 34 Senators who signed the petition that was sent to the White House long before the present session of Congress began, and who was one of four Senators, who went to the White House during the holiday season and pleaded with the President to do something about the situation. The fact that our request was refused was convincing evidence to me that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi was sincere when he asked me to place in the RECORD every word of this report. It was only when he asked me to place it in the RECORD that I agreed to do so.

I want the distinguished Senator from New Mexico to know that I have done just as much as he has done in order to help move forward the FEPC bill on the floor of the Senate of the United States. I was not going to bring the matter up because I did not want to inject any politics into the issue, but so long as the Senator has charged me with being one of the "boys" who have been participating in a filibuster by attempting to have the report made a part of the RECORD—

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. EASTLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor and I will not yield. I want to finish my statement, and after I have completed it I will be glad to yield first to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Among those who signed the petition for cloture were 22 Republican Senators on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. When the petition was signed by me, it was done in the interest of harmony.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. When the petition was submitted yesterday, on top of the Republican petition was a petition which the Senator had circulated containing the names of Democratic Senators, in order to give the impression that the Democratic Senators had signed the petition before the Republican Senators had signed it. After we presented the petition the President pro tempore said, in effect, "Here is a petition which has been filed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and 47 other Senators." I had the statement corrected, to include the name of every Senator who signed the petition printed in the RECORD. When the names were printed the names of Democratic Senators appeared first. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, who is taking advantage of the situation? Many of us on this side of the aisle have done our level best in working with the proponents of the bill in order to have it voted up or down in the United States Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am afraid that the Senator from Nebraska has somewhat confused matters. What he has stated about the Republican Senators who first signed the petition is correct. But the Senator is a little violent in his conclusions as to what actually was

done. The Senator will recall that he handed me a petition on a piece of cardboard with one sheet of paper containing the names of Republican Senators. The paper was attached to the cardboard with clips.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Then I commenced to circulate the petition. I am not apologizing for anything which I did, and I do not feel that anything which I did was wrong. But, as a practical proposition, where does the Senator believe that the other sheet of paper should have been attached?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say that there was plenty of room on the first petition on which to put the 22 signatures which the Senator obtained, and which were placed on top of the sheet of the original petition. The Senator did not need another sheet of paper on which to place the names. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska is taking his republicanism too seriously. There were 24 Democrats and 24 Republicans who signed the petition, so I do not see how anyone obtained any particular advantage. We on this side of the Chamber have never gotten sore because the name of the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken] is the first to appear on roll calls. His name does not appear in that order merely because we want to give the Republicans any kind of an advantage, but his name appears as the first on the roll call because alphabetically it rightly belongs there. I am sorry that there is anything in the RECORD which might possibly indicate that so far as I am concerned any advantage was taken of the Republicans at any time, because I know the Republicans did as much as we did in connection with advancing the pending bill. We had difficulty in trying to get as many Democrats to aid us in our cause as there were Republicans who were willing to help.

Mr. WHERRY. We could have filed a petition when we had obtained 16 Republican names.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. But we did cooperate with the proponents of the measure. The only reason I brought forward the matter to which I have referred is that I am fighting for something which is probably more vital than anything which has ever confronted the Senate. But I do not want to feel that the proponents of the FEPC bill are in position to intimidate that I have been engaged in a prolonged debate to prevent Senate bill 101 coming to a vote. I have done as much as any other proponent of the FEPC bill has done in trying to bring the issue to a conclusion, and I am sure that the Senator will agree with my statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct in what he says. But I am afraid, Mr. President, that the Senator from Nebraska will suffer a great deal more from now on if his sense of humor does not improve. I was facetious in what I said, I may say to the Senator from Nebraska. I was speaking to some of my colleagues on this side of the Chamber and I said to them, in effect, "The only way we can get this matter disposed of is for you boys who are filibustering to go to Eu-

rope right now." That is why I facetiously made the unanimous-consent request, and I hope the Senator did not take offense. I did not have him in mind when I made the request. I was merely trying to indulge in a little levity with my colleagues.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the Senator to repeat his statement the second time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I did repeat it.

Mr. WHERRY. If I understood him correctly he said that he wanted the RECORD to show that "you boys" who are now filibustering should go to Europe. Will the Senator please tell me if that is not what he said?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, the Senator has not been filibustering. So, Mr. President, I did not see any reason for the argument.

Mr. WHERRY. And I am not one of "you boys" to whom the Senator referred in connection with filibustering in the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I was referring, among others to my good friend the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that all our colleagues on both sides of the aisle who saw fit to sign the petition for cloture were very poorly advised. But nevertheless, in the controversy between the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from New Mexico, I must side with the Senator from Nebraska. It is true that the Republicans made as much if not a greater sacrifice than did the Democrats in signing the petition for cloture. They sought to have brought to a vote a bill which would create in this country an all-powerful Commission, which is being espoused by some Democrats, but on which no provision is made for any Republican representation. In their anxiety to have the bill brought to a vote the Republicans signed what was equivalent to a voluntary admission of political bankruptcy and lack of responsibility on their part by demanding the creation of such an agency. So, Mr. President, in my opinion, the Senator from New Mexico was most unjust in his references to Republican Senators who were willing to make the kind of sacrifice which they made in endeavoring to bring the bill to a vote.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if any political advantage was gained, or any sacrifice made, it was when more than 16 Republican Senators signed the petition for cloture and turned it over to the proponents of the measure to be circulated.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. If that act did not indicate a nonpartisan attitude, I do not know how such an attitude could be indicated in connection with matters involving proposed legislation.

With regard to the remarks of the Senator from Georgia concerning the bankrupt Republican Party, a challenge is ever made to the Republican Party to fight when issues arise which vitally affect the interests of America. In meeting those issues in this body we rendered one of the greatest services that could be

rendered by the Members of the United States Senate.

I, for one, am not only going back to Nebraska when I have an opportunity, but whenever I speak I am certainly going to rededicate my life not only to one issue, but all issues which I think are truly American.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his speeches pointing out what he thinks about the philosophy of the bill. I wish to thank him for pointing out to those who want to recommit the bill some of its provisions which possibly should be amended.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator think a bill which denies his party any recognition whatever on the Commission provided for is a good measure?

Mr. WHERRY. My answer to the distinguished Senator from Georgia is that I voted for cloture because I thought the time had come when we should shut off debate on the particular issue of amending the Journal, and get down to business on legislation that is now confronting the Senate of the United States, such as the rescission bill, or the wage-hour bill, or other bills. I voted to proceed to the consideration of the pending bill because I had declared myself for the principles of an FEPC bill, and the bill I declared myself for was endorsed not only by the Republican platform, not only nationally, but in my State. I believe those principles are sound, and I believe the distinguished Senator from Georgia would subscribe to them as they were thus promulgated.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would never subscribe to any policy under which someone could hand me a bill which I would accept as being a party platform measure when it did not even provide for representation by my party. As I have stated heretofore, I have seen the time when only about 17 Republican Senators were Members of the Senate, but they insisted on having bipartisan representation on boards created by Congress. Now we come to a board to control all boards and to end all boards. We would not need any more boards or bureaus, or need any more government, if we passed Senate bill 101. Yet the Senator signed a cloture petition to shut off debate before it had even been pointed out on the floor of the Senate that the bill did not provide for bipartisan representation.

Mr. WHERRY. I must believe that the distinguished Senator from Georgia, for whom I have the highest regard, knows just as well as I do that cloture is one thing and voting on a bill is another.

The charge is being made that because a Senator votes for cloture he approves everything in Senate bill 101. The distinguished Senator from Georgia knows that is not the case. We have a perfect right to propose amendments; we can offer amendments from the time the petition is filed until the bill is voted on.

I agree with the Senator on the question of a non-partisan Commission, and I agree with him on his suggestion about amendments to Senate bill 101, but I say once again to the distinguished Senator, because I know how he feels in his heart for his fellow men, that he would vote just as quickly as anyone would for the

declared principles of an FEPC bill which provided equal opportunity for Americans, whether they were white or black. I know the Senator would subscribe to that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would do it, but I would not do it at the expense of the Constitution and of the individual American citizen.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has a perfect right to his opinion, but I am satisfied we possibly could recommit the bill and have it reported by the committee with the necessary amendments in it, and I am satisfied we would go a long way toward passing it upon the basis on which I think the legislation should be drawn.

Mr. President, I did not rise this afternoon to engage in a debate on the FEPC. I have declared myself heretofore. I hope my remarks will not be misunderstood. I merely wanted the proponents of the measure to know that when I came in with a report, because of its seriousness, and because of the gravity of the situation, when I am asked by Senators to place it in the RECORD, I have taken the only means I know of to place it in the RECORD, that is to read it in. As I was reading the report the question arose whether or not one who takes any time is filibustering. I merely want the RECORD to show that I, for one, am not filibustering. I voted to make the FEPC bill the unfinished business, and I signed the cloture petition because I thought the time had arrived when we should have a vote on the bill, and so far as I am concerned, there is no need for another 5 minutes of argument.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator said that there is no need for another 5 minutes of argument; that he is ready to vote on the bill in 5 minutes. Does the Senator think the bill could be revised so that in 5 minutes he could conscientiously favor it and vote on it.

Mr. WHERRY. If I said vote on the bill, I should have said that I am ready to vote on cloture in 5 minutes. I correct that, Mr. President. If I said the bill, what I meant was cloture.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe the Senator agrees with me that as now written it is almost impossible to so amend the bill as to make it acceptable. We would simply have to rewrite it on the floor of the Senate before the bill could pass, before the Senator would be willing to vote for the bill. Does not the Senator agree with me that the only proper thing to do in this situation is to recommit the bill and leave it in committee until such time as a bill can be brought out which will give some promise of preserving human liberty?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, as I understand the statement of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, it is that the cause of FEPC would be subserved if the bill were recommitted and redrafted.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to answer the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in this way: I think a vote on cloture should first be had, if we can get it, because I feel that if cloture prevailed there would be an opportunity to offer amendments to the bill, and if the amendments were satisfactory, it would

be up to Senators whether or not they wanted to pass the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. He suggests that various amendments might be made to the bill in the Senate. Has the Senator any assurance such amendments would be retained by the House?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has the Senator any assurance that the amendments might not be stricken out by the House?

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. MAYBANK. I call that to the attention of the Senator because he and I see eye to eye on many things, but as to this particular bill, if we should put an amendment on it, it might be stricken out, and then we would be left to vote on a conference report and vote it either up or down.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement. As I understand, we are debating an appeal from the decision of the Chair as to the right to file a cloture petition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OVERTON in the chair.) The Senator is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. If the appeal were sustained, then it would take unanimous consent, as I understand the Senate rules, to offer an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. EASTLAND. I am certainly going to object, and I know other Senators who are going to object, and as I understand the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, he is not in favor of the bill as it is now written.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. EASTLAND. That being true, I know a great number of other Senators who are not, and while I am against the whole thing, and desire to be frank about it, why would not the cause of the FEPC bill be furthered if the bill were recommitted?

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield so that I may make an observation? I have been asked questions by two Senators.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield to me to make a short statement?

Mr. WHERRY. I defer to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. With reference to the statement I made regarding the House of Representatives, I meant no slur, or anything of the kind. I referred to the cold, brutal fact of what might happen to any amendment which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska might put on the bill, or any amendment that might be put on the bill by the distinguished Senator from Indiana, who, I think, has an amendment pending. Who knows that those amendments will be kept in the bill by the House?

Mr. EASTLAND. There are no amendments pending, none have been filed and read. No amendment can be offered except by unanimous consent, and I am going to object.

Mr. MAYBANK. I presume, of course, the bill would be returned to the calen-

dar, and come back on the floor in regular form to be amended.

Mr. EASTLAND. The bill would have to be recommitment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield so that I may answer one or two of the various questions which have been asked?

Mr. EASTLAND. I greatly appreciate the lengthy contribution of the Senator from Nebraska. I think he is doing very well.

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina about the House of Representatives, and about amendments which might be offered and which might be modified in the House, I agree that the House might do anything. My responsibility ceases when the bill leaves the Senate of the United States, and then the House takes its own responsibility for whatever it does.

Mr. MAYBANK. I might say to the Senator that that is the very reason why we do not intend to let this bill leave the Senate of the United States. I am not apprehensive, but no one knows what might happen.

Mr. WHERRY. If I may be permitted to answer the second question, namely, am I in favor of recommitting the bill, I should like to continue my statement by making this observation: I think that if possible we should be able to get a vote on cloture. I am giving my opinion. I think we should have a vote. As I said before, I think the time has arrived when we should vote up or down the question whether the bill should come to the floor of the Senate and amendments be offered.

Mr. EASTLAND. How could amendments be offered?

Mr. WHERRY. They certainly could not be offered unless those who are against the bill give us unanimous consent to offer them.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is not going to happen. Now, does not the Senator think the bill should be recommitment?

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator permit me to proceed with my answer?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. If we cannot have a vote on cloture—and I admit that because of the rules of the Senate those in opposition have it in their power to prevent a vote on cloture—then I am ready either to recommit the bill, or take up some other business, and let the bill automatically go back upon the calendar.

Mr. EASTLAND. I do not know, but I do not think we are going to get a vote on cloture.

Mr. MAYBANK. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I rather agree with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, and differ with my distinguished friend the Senator from Nebraska, on the question of a vote on cloture. Does not the Senator from Nebraska believe that the list of those who signed the petition for cloture includes practically every Senator who would vote for cloture? I am not binding anyone.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator is asking me a question which is very difficult to

answer because I do not know what the Members of the Senate would do on the vote.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that many Senators have been bombarded by telegrams? Please do not misunderstand me.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot answer for other Senators.

Mr. MAYBANK. I noticed an article in various publications today under the headline "Wire your Senator to sign cloture." It states that certain Senators have signed the cloture petition, and so on, and so forth. My general thought is, though I have not talked to anyone about that matter, that most of those who would vote for cloture signed the petition. But there is no chance to vote for cloture because there can be no cloture vote on the question of amending the Journal.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to continue with the report?

Mr. EASTLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Before continuing with the report, I would say that because of the parliamentary procedure and the rules of the Senate those who are against FEPC, of course, have a perfect right to filibuster. They can do so under the rules of the Senate. That is their method; that is the only way they have to defeat either the pending business or the FEPC bill, if it is not the pending business, and they are adopting that procedure. On the other hand, the only way the proponents of the measure can secure action is to bring to an issue the cloture petition.

Mr. EASTLAND. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska certainly would not accuse anyone of filibustering.

Mr. WHERRY. All I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi is that I feel that from a practical point of view—and we might just as well be frank about the matter—those who are opposed to the FEPC bill are proceeding in a perfectly practical fashion within the rules of the Senate to continue to debate the subject. But I think if we defined what is now going on we will find that, in reality, it is a filibuster against the measure. I want to say again that Senators who oppose the FEPC have a perfect right to continue to debate the measure so long as they please under the rules of the Senate. The only way the Senate can break up that procedure—and I think this is a significant point because such a situation might arise again in connection with other legislation—if the opponents continue, the only remedy we have is to vote on cloture. If those who are against the pending measure will not permit a vote on cloture—and apparently they have the strength to continue, and at least they say they will not permit the question to be brought to a vote—if and when we learn that there are not sufficient votes to bring about cloture, then, I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, I think the time will have come when the people of the country expect us to take up some other measure, either a measure which is on the calendar or a measure which will be reported to the calendar, so we

may get on with the business of the Senate. While I am one of those who signed the cloture petition, and I should like to have a vote taken on it, and I should like to have the FEPC bill debated on the floor of the Senate and opportunity to be given to vote for an amended bill, yet, if that is denied us, I am ready, along with the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from South Carolina, to take up some other matter, and proceed with the work of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me so I may ask a question?

Mr. EASTLAND. I should like to suggest that surely the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is not serious in saying that a filibuster is in progress. I am against the bill and I know I am not filibustering. I think the distinguished Senator owes me an apology. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator from Mississippi realize that I was not filibustering when I took the floor of the Senate this afternoon to make a statement on an important matter.

Mr. EASTLAND. The Senator has spoken as long as I have this afternoon, and he says I am filibustering and that he is not.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, taking the chance of again being castigated, I wish to ask the question: What are both Senators doing?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am opposing FEPC and exposing its iniquities.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator, who is always very courteous. I appreciate his patience. Now that he has made it plain that he is not filibustering, I hope he will permit me to continue with the report. In view of the fact that he insisted that I read it into the Record, I hope he will permit me now to continue, and not to accuse me of filibustering.

I come now to the next part of the report on page 3 which is headed, "Report on a transport of evacuees from the refugee camp at Kahnisdorf, Province of Brandenburg, to Demmin, Mecklenburg."

I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that the charges here made are almost identical with the charges made in connection with the Cottbus Camp, 65 miles from Berlin, in the Russian zone.

The report speaks of evacuees shipped in cattle cars with no heating facilities. The same condition prevails in the case of the evacuees who were transported to the other camps.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad the Senator from Nebraska spoke of evacuees being shipped in freight cars. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that today a serious car shortage exists in this country. The ODT, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the railroads are having great difficulty in allocating freight cars. A measure is now before the Committee

on Appropriations, of which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska is a member, in connection with which the freight car situation in this country will be dealt with. I am told that many cars are held up; and that grain elevators and shippers generally cannot obtain sufficient cars. Is that a correct statement of the situation?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the Senator if he does not think the all-important independent offices appropriations bill should not be acted upon by the committee and brought to the floor of the Senate and given at least some priority, so that the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Office of Defense Transportation, may be given sufficient funds to do what is necessary to bring relief in the tangled situation that exists respecting freight-car movements?

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. I know that approximately 75 cars filled with wheat a day leave Omaha for seaboard ports. When they once reach the seaboard it is difficult to get them back to the Middle West. Our farmers who would like to ship their grain to market cannot get a sufficient number of cars. The situation is very serious in our section of the country, and as it progresses it will become much more serious. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I am in favor of the action he proposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am happy to hear the Senator say so.

Mr. WHERRY. The report deals with what took place on the journey from the refugee camp at Kahnsdorf to Demmin; with the accommodations in the train, with the matter of provisions, and sanitary conditions. Those of us who were members of the committee which went to Germany and saw the train with 3,100 bodies in it which stood in front of the camp at Dachau know what it is for people to be shipped in freight cars under such conditions as would cause many of them to starve to death. We know something of the sanitary conditions in these freight cars. The report speaks of the conditions in the freight cars, stating that people were treated like cattle as they were being shipped westward and finally wound up in the American zone, for which we are responsible.

The fourth part of the report is headed "Plight of refugees in Mecklenburg." Eyewitness report of a woman social worker.

It tells of the many cases of typhoid which exist there today. It says the county hospital in Hagenow is equipped with 400 beds, but had 900 patients.

The report says child mortality among the evacuees, due to insufficient food, strain of the trek, and lack of sanitation and care, is estimated at 30 percent, and that approximately 10 percent of the children die of hunger and the remainder from disease.

Certainly we ought to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate the fact that an investigation should be made in the area in which we have responsibility.

Then the report deals with venereal disease conditions. It speaks of the

various dread diseases that have afflicted the people who are confined in these camps. It is simply a repetition of the conditions which existed in the concentration camps which the Senate Committee visited.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EYEWITNESSES' REPORTS FROM RUSSIAN- AND POLISH-CONTROLLED TERRITORIES

From a large number of reports, a few have been selected to give a picture of (a) the transport of evacuees through Polish- and Russian-controlled territories, (b) conditions within the refugee camps in the Russian zone, and (c) the situation existing in those parts of the Russian zone to which the stream of refugees has been directed.

The following reports have been rendered by reliable German observers who have recently traveled extensively through territories in question:

"DECEMBER 4, 1945.

"NEW WAVE OF EVACUATION FROM BRESLAU—EYEWITNESS REPORT OF A PROMINENT CLERGYMAN"

"A new wave of evacuation of the German population from Breslau has been going on for the past 2 weeks. At present the number of Germans in Breslau is not more than 160,000, as compared with a Polish population of 60,000. (In September the number of Germans in Breslau was reported as 200,000.)

"The official expulsion order covers the following groups of the city's German population:

- "1. All able-bodied unemployed.
 - "2. All women with small children, unavailable for labor.
 - "3. Old and sick, insofar as they are able to travel.
 - "4. Those cleaning up the streets, insofar as their work is not regarded as vital.
- "The block leaders have to list all Germans who fall within these designated groups. Using their list as a guide, the expulsions are carried out in such a manner that those arrested have to leave their homes within half an hour. They have to line up on the street, are then picked up and taken under guard to the 'Stadthafen' freight depot, where they are loaded into unheated freight cars and shipped west in the direction of the Russian-Polish border via the towns of Obernigk, Rawitsch, Glogau, and Forst.

"In this way 40,000 to 60,000 Germans are being removed from Breslau. These evacuation measures seem especially inhuman, as most persons belonging to groups 2 and 3, and also some in group 1, are dependent on outside aid in order to move out of the city. As such assistance is not available, it can be stated without exaggeration that for many, especially the children, old, and sick, the forthcoming expulsion means certain death."

"DECEMBER 8, 1945.

"REFUGEE CAMP, ANNABERGSTRASSE, COTTBUS, IN THE RUSSIAN ZONE, SOUTHEAST OF BERLIN"

"(This report was rendered by an objective anti-Nazi official of one of the large Berlin banks, who made a special investigation of conditions in the Cottbus camp. The 65-mile rail journey, Berlin to Cottbus, which in normal times took 2 hours, required 15 hours.)

"The refugee camp in Cottbus is situated on the eastern outskirts of the city. It consists of 20 barracks and covers an area 300 by 600 feet. The condition of the camp is very bad. The impression is one of complete demoralization. In most of the barracks there are no windows. The barracks cannot be

heated, except for the hospital barracks, as there are neither stoves nor fuel available. There is no electricity, as the lines were damaged and have not yet been repaired.

"The most necessary fixtures, such as beds, wardrobes, tables, and benches are missing. The refugees, with their children, have to live, eat, and sleep on the floors. The small amount of straw available has been used so much that it has become matted and hard. It is pitiful to see fathers beg the camp director, in vain, for coal to prevent their children from freezing to death.

"Bathing installations are broken and the delousing facilities of the camp cannot be used, due to lack of coal. As a result, there is no delousing. When entering the camp the evacuees receive no inoculations against contagious diseases.

"The suffering of the evacuees is indescribable. Driven out by Polish soldiers and militia, they had to leave their houses and farms in Polish-controlled territory, often on less than 1 hour's notice. They are allowed to take with them only the barest essentials of clothes and foodstuffs. Their papers are taken from them and their baggage is ransacked—everything of value is taken. Sometimes they have to walk all day to the Polish-Russian border and then remain standing all night while their baggage is searched. Children fall down from exhaustion and go to sleep in the mud. Transportation by train through Polish-controlled territory seems to be the exception.

"The crossing of the evacuees from Polish-controlled into Russian-controlled territory takes place over the Oder and Neisse bridges primarily at Frankfurt on Oder, Fuerstenberg, Guben, Forst, and Goerlitz. Having arrived on the Russian side, the refugees shift for themselves, trying to get into camps. In the Cottbus camp, the refugees arrive alone or in groups up to 200 people.

"Farmers comprise the largest group of the evacuees. There are also manual laborers of every type, tradesmen, officials, bargemen, etc., with their families. The absence of intellectuals, with the exception of a few teachers, is noticeable.

"Generally the refugees stay in the camp from 8 to 14 days until a large enough group has collected. Then, in groups of from 400 to 600, they are shipped on by train. At the time set by the camp leader, the evacuees gather at the station with their baggage. They often have to wait 1 or 2 days around the destroyed station buildings until the Russians give the permit for the trip.

"The evacuees receive for the trip provisions consisting of 1,500 grams of bread per person for 5 days. They should also receive 30 grams of butter per day which, however, is rarely available. This is all they get. They are shipped in unheated freight cars. Many people die on these transports. The situation might be somewhat improved if refugee trains had priority over freight trains, especially coal trains, which are continually moving onto the now one-track line, Berlin-Gottbus-Goerlitz.

"It was impossible to get a clear picture of the organizational side of the transport. The camp director stated that he receives directions from the city mayor's office to collect the refugees at the station at a certain time. The last transport, carrying 1,600 refugees, allegedly went to Mecklenburg."

"REPORT ON A TRANSPORT OF EVACUEES FROM THE REFUGEE CAMP AT KAHNSDORF, PROVINCE OF BRANDENBURG, TO DEMMIN, MECKLENBURG"

"(This report is an extract from a letter by a welfare organization to the Central Administration for Refugees (in the Russian zone), asking for an improvement in the conditions of transport of evacuees.)

"1. Journey"

"On Friday, November 23, at 11 a. m. a train with 2,000 evacuees from the camps at Kahnsdorf and Forst (Province of Branden-

burg in the Russian zone), was scheduled to leave the railway station Luckau for the north. The train did not leave until 8:30 p. m. A doctor, an intern, and two nurses accompanied the transport.

"The destination, Fuerstenberg, at the Mecklenburg border, about 100 miles away, was reached on Saturday at 7 p. m. When the train arrived, it was announced that Fuerstenberg could not accept the evacuees. The train then proceeded to Stralsund, a distance of 70 miles, arriving there Sunday, November 25, at about 11 a. m. As the evacuees were likewise turned away, the train was shunted back to Demmin—30 miles. Obviously, no preparations had been made to receive the people there; the train remained in the station, as the Landrat had to give his permission for the unloading. At 5 p. m. an order came that the train had to be unloaded immediately, as the freight cars had to be returned to Forst.

"The lights went out. The 2,000 refugees, among whom were many women with children, cripples, old people and invalids, were thus unloaded in complete darkness and the greatest confusion. There were no stretchers nor was there any transportation. Those who could not walk were simply laid on the platform. A lunatic who had been included in the transport and kept in the caboose had escaped.

"2. Accommodations on the train

"The refugee train consisted of 41 freight cars and one conductor's car. One car was marked with a red cross and apparently was meant to serve as a hospital coach. The doors did not close. There were no facilities for lying down, no straw, and no heat.

"Occupants of two of the 41 cars were able to secure two small stoves during the journey, but all the other cars remained without heat.

"3. Provisions

"Upon departing, the refugees received 2 days' rations. They arrived in Demmin only on the evening of the third day. There was no warm food on the entire trip, not even for the small children, old, and sick people. The nurses had no warm food for 7 days.

"4. Sanitary conditions

"A 15½-year-old girl, who was in labor pains and an 18-year-old girl with a bleeding kidney infection had to be unloaded at Fuerstenberg.

"Two women had such bad diarrhea that their presence would not be tolerated by their cotravelers. Lacking other facilities, they were taken into the so-called hospital car, which was used to carry the corpses of evacuees who had died on the trip.

"Most of the evacuees were suffering from diarrhea. Many used the corners of the car to take care of their needs. A half-crippled man on the train fell in his own excrement. No further illustration need be given of the danger of infection in such a train, under these conditions."

"FLIGHT OF REFUGEES IN MECKLENBURG—EYEWITNESS REPORT OF A WOMAN SOCIAL WORKER—END OF NOVEMBER 1945

"According to an official estimate, there are 35,000 cases of typhoid today in the Land Mecklenburg. The number of doctors and assistants throughout the land is very limited; as a result, there is such a delay in the treatment of patients that they often remain with their families for 2 or 3 weeks, thus infecting the other family members. A pastor in Rostock cites an instance in the town of Kroeplin where a man suffering from typhoid is compelled to share a straw mattress with his wife and 8 children; they have to eat in the same room. The children are inadequately clothed, undernourished, and cannot be kept clean, as no soap or washing materials have been issued since last May.

"In Rostock, the administration has released only one horse-drawn hearse for trans-

porting the bodies, wrapped in blackout paper, to the cemetery. As a result, the dead bodies remain a comparatively long time with the families. During the period from November 24 to 26, 120 bodies had to be removed. Since many bodies are in rooms where people are still living, eating and sleeping, it is not surprising that there is so much sickness.

"The hospitals are overfilled. The county hospital in Hagenow, Mecklenburg, for example, is equipped with 400 beds, but at the end of November had about 900 patients. Many of the hospital attendants are sick as a result of overwork and lack of nourishment. Food for the patients is insufficient. According to the doctor in Tessin, the patients in many instances do not get more than 600 calories of food daily.

"Child mortality amongst the evacuees, due to insufficient food, strain of the trek, and lack of sanitation and care, is estimated at 30 percent. Approximately 10 percent of the children die of hunger, and the balance from disease.

"Venereal disease throughout Mecklenburg and Pomerania is widespread. There is, however, a marked difference between those districts which were first occupied by American or British troops and later on turned over to the Russians, and those which were originally conquered by the Russians. In the former, cases of venereal disease amount to only one percent. In Pomerania, a province originally occupied by the Russians, it is reported that 8 out of 10 girls have been raped and that 6 out of 8 girls are infected with venereal disease. Medical supplies to treat these cases are altogether lacking.

"The 'Landesverwaltung' (German administration in the Russian zone) has established a number of overnight camps, quarantine stations, and permanent camps at different railway junctions. In the Hagenow district (Mecklenburg) I had an opportunity to visit some of these camps. One camp, as well as the barracks at the station, was adequate. The rooms are kept clean and can be heated; there are cooking facilities, although primitive. The toilets are sufficient and are kept clean. This camp, which is in one of the railroad buildings, is not being plundered and attacked by the Russians; in fact, the Russians protect the hospital barracks which the Red Cross has established for those unable to travel. Every patient has his own bed with a straw mattress. A doctor visits the sick refugees daily.

"Conditions are appalling in the former prisoner's camp at the Hagenow station. The camp director, a Communist, showed me the camp, which was full of vermin of every kind. This camp is often attacked by the Russians and if women try to defend themselves against being raped, their barracks are set on fire by the Russians. I have personally seen three such burned barracks.

"The refugees undergo their worst ordeal at the stations and the trains. They worry whether they can get into the trains and complete the journey without being plundered by the Russians and thrown out of the coaches, or be molested and raped. The same insecurity exists if they have to spend a night in the station. There are not enough waiting rooms to protect them from cold, dampness, and wind.

"They cower outside the entrance, tired, apathetic, and hungry, until they faint. An average of 4 to 10 bodies are taken out of trains at every large junction, such as Schwerin, Rostock, Ludwigslust.

"I have particularly horrible memories of the night of November 26-27 in Wismar. At 11 p. m. there were about 3,000 people in the station trying to get to Berlin. The night was very cold and it was snowing. A prisoner returning from Russia, his leg amputated, shaking from cold, was limping around trying to find his relatives. An old woman, her arm broken, sat near me; she had no coat,

as the Poles had taken it from her. Near me was a married couple from Allenstein. The man had wrapped his wife in a shawl. During the flight she had gone crazy; he was trying to go to the west and did not want to leave his wife alone in this condition. The whimpering of the woman and the cries from time to time were almost unbearable. A young woman had lost one child on the trip and buried another; she did not know where to turn, as her life no longer had any meaning. She regarded, with tragic eyes, a mother who had three children and who moved about the whole night, trying to protect them from freezing. From time to time I walked through the crowd in order to help. The toilets were in terrible condition. The people were also crowding into the toilets in order not to freeze. When the gates were opened the people got on the train like wild animals; those left behind—the tired, weak, and sick—crowded together and had to live through another 24 hours at the station. Some old people and women with small children already spending their third night there, as the Russians had requisitioned some of the coaches."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that every word of the report should be read by every Member of the United States Senate.

In conclusion, I should like to say again that the Foreign Relations Committee will meet, as I understand, tomorrow. The concurrent resolution is now before that committee. I should be perfectly willing to accept the amendments suggested by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the amendment suggested by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I should be glad to broaden the joint resolution as much as the Senate wishes to. Once again I desire to say that I feel that a nonpartisan committee of 12 should be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by the Speaker of the House, to be composed in equal numbers of members of the Republican and Democratic Parties, and equipped with sufficient technical personnel to conduct thorough investigations. The committee should have available individuals who are authorities on the subjects of medicine, food, and housing. The committee and its technical personnel should be flown immediately to Europe to conduct investigations.

Mr. President, what I have stated today and what I stated last week is based on reports which have come to me. The Senator from Mississippi, who was a member of an investigating committee which went to Europe, knows how bad the situation is in Europe. Saturday night the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Dean Acheson, made the statement that many people would starve in Europe this winter and that the time had come when we in this country should go back to rationing in order to provide food to send across the water. If what has been stated is the situation which exists on the average level in Europe, what, Mr. President, do you think is the situation in the Russian zone? If 1,500 calories a day are given those who live in the American zone, what do you think the situation is in the zone occupied by France, and in the zone occupied by Russia? I believe we are entitled to know what the Control Commission is doing in enforcing the terms of the Potsdam agreement.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I do not think the distinguished Senator

from Nebraska is painting exactly an accurate condition of the situation in Germany. He must remember that there is no coal for heating in Germany. Houses there are not heated. There is some heat provided in other European countries. More food is required to sustain the human body when the people must live in unheated houses.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator once more for his contribution.

In conclusion I wish to say that I hope and pray that the Foreign Relations Committee will consider this concurrent resolution and report it back to the Senate immediately, so that there can be appointed a committee to go to Europe and make a first-hand investigation, right on the ground, and bring back to the Congress of the United States accurate information concerning the conditions which exist, so Congress can make proper recommendations to the President as to what should be done before it is entirely too late. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that I very much appreciate his suggestion that I read this report into the Record. I hope that he and other opponents of the FEPC bill will feel that I was sincere and serious, and that it was not done in the spirit of continuing a filibuster or a debate upon Senate bill 101.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I shall be glad to go with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I believe that this is a very important subject. I know that it is fraught with peril to the future of our country and the future of world peace.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the minority leader, has asked me if it would meet with my approval to suspend at a rather early hour this afternoon because of some matters which he must take up with members of the minority party. It is my purpose, after disposing of some executive business, to move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. EASTLAND. With the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course. I should like to have the Executive Calendar called before the Senate takes a recess.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is agreeable to me.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CHAVEZ. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Lt. Gen. Edmund B. Gregory to be War Assets Administrator, effective upon retirement from the Army,

which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BARKLEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Fred M. Vinson, of Kentucky, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund and United States Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years;

William L. Clayton, of Texas, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund, and United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years;

Harry D. White, of Maryland, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed;

Emilio G. Collado, of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years and until his successor has been appointed;

Wilson W. Wyatt, of Kentucky, to be National Housing Administrator;

Harvey Jones Gunderson, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of 2 years from January 22, 1946 (reappointment);

Henry T. Bodman, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of 2 years from January 22, 1946; and

Charles B. Henderson, of Nevada, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term of 2 years from January 22, 1946 (reappointment).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Frank P. Douglass, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1949.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Candler Cobb for appointment as Director of Selective Service for New York City under the provisions of section 10 (a) (3) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended;

Sundry officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law; and

Sundry officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

THE NAVY—NOMINATION PASSED OVER; REMAINING NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, one of the nominations in the Navy is that of Earle W. Mills to be vice admiral, for temporary service, effective from December 31, 1945. I ask that that nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination of Earle W. Mills to be vice admiral in the Navy will be passed over; and, without objection, the remaining Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond R. Wright to be paymaster general of the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Roy M. Shelbourne to be United States district judge for the western district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward S. Kampf to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

CHIEF JUDGE, MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nathan Cayton to be chief judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexander M. Campbell to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Vincent Keogh to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Al W. Hosinski to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Comeford to be United States marshal for the western district of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. CHAVEZ. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 6, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 5 (legislative day of January 18), 1946:

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATOR

Lt Gen. Edmund B. Gregory to be War Assets Administrator, effective upon retirement from the Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 5 (legislative day of January 18), 1946:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Roy M. Shelbourne to be United States district judge for the western district of Kentucky.

Edward S. Kampf to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

CHIEF JUDGE, MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Nathan Cayton to be chief judge, Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Alexander M. Campbell to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

J. Vincent Keogh to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Al W. Hosinski to be United States marshal for the northern district of Indiana. (Now serving under an appointment which expired July 3, 1945.)

John M. Comeford to be United States marshal for the western district of Wisconsin. (Now serving under an appointment which expired October 30, 1945.)

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Patrick N. L. Bellinger to be vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from October 5, 1943.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

To be assistant surgeons with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade)

Charles D. Adams	Carl L. Johnson
Alfred Agrin	Edward A. Johnson
John H. Annegers, Jr.	Andrew Johnston
Ernest M. Barker	Lloyd H. Klefsstad
Bernard A. L. Bellew	John A. Leam
Frank W. Bussard	Gordon V. Lillie
Joseph P. Cannon	Joseph T. Lucas, Jr.
George C. Chaney	Glenn L. Marshall, Jr.
James F. Clearly, Jr.	Theodore R. Marvin
Edward B. Crohn	Hugh B. McAdams
Bernard F. Danton, Jr.	Hoyt B. Miles, Jr.
Francis D. Donahue	Albert D. Nelson, Jr.
Frederick F. Ferguson	Leonard R. Ortega
Rodes C. Garby	Ralph R. Preston
William D. Grant	Alan Raftery
Alfred E. Gras	Wilfred N. Sanders
Jack M. Gruender	David J. Sanderson
Robert L. Henry, Jr.	Clinton R. Strong
William L. Hutchinson	Loy T. Swinehart
William J. Jenkins	Frank M. Thornburg

John A. Twaddle Edwin C. Welsh
Wallace R. Van Den Clifford A. Wiethoff
Bosch

To be lieutenant

Frank L. Lawlor

To be assistant paymaster, with the rank of ensign

Ralph G. Leedy

IN THE MARINE CORPS

To be Paymaster General of the Marine Corps for a period of 4 years from February 1, 1946

Raymond R. Wright

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Dora L. Raulerson, Hortense.

INDIANA

John Leonard, Birdseye.
James Perona, Blanford.
Dorothy Fohl, Cedar Grove.
William O. Burgess, Gas City.
James E. Cox, Newburgh.
Elsie B. Johnson, Westpoint.

KANSAS

Marjorie A. Cain, Delphos.
George M. Thomas, Morrowville.

MISSOURI

Frank A. Johnson, Gainesville.

MONTANA

Albert Leo Nix, Wibaux.

NEBRASKA

Julius E. Arnold, Big Springs.
Edward Borzych, Farwell.
Martha E. Castor, Stockville.

NORTH CAROLINA

Bessie L. Adams, Blounts Creek.
Willie T. Smith, Dudley.
Mildred C. Thompson, Hallsboro.
Helen J. Dellinger, Iron Station.
William R. Miller, Laurel Springs.

OKLAHOMA

Leroy K. Hawkins, Boynton.
Evah Kirksey, Porter.

WEST VIRGINIA

Cordia H. Covert, Yawkey.

WISCONSIN

Helen A. Feye, Eastman.
Rachel P. Porter, Fontana.
Stella J. McCollow, River Falls.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou merciful and mighty Spirit, come and rule in our hearts and direct our minds and labors. Breathe through the heats of our desire that all our efforts may be for the solution and the transfiguration of the hard paths of toil. Let us proclaim to the discouraged and all in need the evangel of our Elder Brother and meet courageously the test of our stewardship. In word and deed, may we confess that the best and the most enduring contribution we can make to our country is our faith in God and our fellow men. Vouchsafe to the Congress a very earnest sense of its responsibility by proving its fidelity to all the fundamental principles of our Republic. Allow us not to walk in paths of blind confusion or tarry in the chill of doubt, but so serve our land that its

imperial soul shall breast the tides of change and live on with freedom as its immortal pursuit and life's richest attainment. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from committee:

JANUARY 28, 1946.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Elections No. 3 of the House of Representatives.

Respectfully,

HUGH PETERSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the New York Journal-American.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a quotation from James Madison and one from Abraham Lincoln and in the other two letters written to him on the question of the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. DOLLIVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from R. K. Bliss, Iowa director of the Extension Service.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem written by F. J. Lyons, of Conception Junction, Mo.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE GREAT WAR WORK OF MR. PETER HANSEN, OF BEATRICE, NEBR.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great patriot. I refer to Mr. Peter Hansen, of Beatrice, Nebr. Although Mr. Hansen is past 77 years of age, and has spent most of the last 2 years in a hospital, when VJ-day came he was knitting his one hundred and thirty-eighth sweater for the members of our armed forces. Since that time he

has completed two more. Mr. Hansen was born in Denmark, the ninth child in a family of 10. When he was 6 years old his mother taught him to knit. During World War I he used to knit in his idle moments while traveling on the train as a salesman. When this war came he started to knit again and made 12 sweaters in the bundles for Britain campaign. When the United States entered the war his time and talents were given to the bundles for America program, and it was in that program that he made the 140 sweaters.

Mr. Speaker, we are a great nation because of individuals like Mr. Peter Hansen. He is a man who loves his country more than self, and who gives his time and his talents for the preservation of our great Republic.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on surplus property for veterans and include a letter from one of his constituents.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances, in one to include several letters, and in the other to include an editorial.

PROPOSED UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of making a statement in which I think the membership of the House should be interested and to correct some erroneous reports that have gone out in the press. There have been statements made in the press from time to time during the last 10 days that the Committee on Military Affairs had abandoned the idea of further consideration of universal military training. That is an incorrect statement. Hearings have been set for the purpose of completing the hearings on that legislation, starting on the 18th day of this month and running probably through the week. The purpose of the committee is to do something about legislation that has been recommended by the President of the United States. We propose to give this House an opportunity to express its wishes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks and include a recent newspaper article.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from the addresses of Mr. Vishinsky and Mr. Bevins at the UNO Security Council yesterday.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

TENDERING THANKS OF CONGRESS TO GENERAL OF THE ARMY GEORGE C. MARSHALL AND MEMBERS OF ARMY OF UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 243) tendering the thanks of Congress to General of the Army George C. Marshall, and the members of the Army of the United States who have fought under his direction during the wars; and providing that the President of the United States shall cause a medal to be struck to be presented to General Marshall in the name of the people of the United States of America.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the thanks of the American people and of the Congress be, and they hereby are, presented to General of the Army George C. Marshall, for his statesmanship as a member of the Combined Chiefs of Staff in cementing the moral and physical forces of the United Nations in the common cause against aggression and his leadership in formulating and executing the global strategy of the wars; his initiative, wisdom, and foresight as Chief of Staff of the Army in conducting the expansion, equipping, training, and deployment of the great Army of the United States to the high degree which enabled it to go directly from its training camps and maneuver grounds to overcome the strongest forces which our determined enemies could amass; and his selfless integrity, inflexible patriotism, and surpassing military genius which guided our armies directly to the heart of the homelands of our enemies; and to the members of the Army of the United States under his direction for their heroic valor and unwavering loyalty and service throughout the wars.

Sec. 2. The President of the United States is requested to cause a gold medal to be struck, with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be presented to General Marshall. When the said medal shall have been struck, the President shall cause a copy of this joint resolution to be engrossed on parchment, and shall transmit the same, together with the said medal, to General Marshall to be presented to him in the name of the people of the United States of America.

Sec. 3. A sufficient sum of money to carry this joint resolution into effect is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 2, after the word "hereby", insert the words "authorized to be."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to consider was laid on the table.

AGNES J. ALLBERRY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 865) for the relief of the estate of Agnes J. Allberry.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is a very close legal question involved in this matter. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MRS. GERTRUDE VERBARG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1073) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Verbarg.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ORVIS WELCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2167) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Orvis Welch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Texas, notwithstanding any statute of the State of Texas limiting the time within which actions in tort may be brought, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Orvis Welch, of Paris, Tex., against the United States, on account of personal injuries resulting from an accident involving a vehicle operated by the War Department, which occurred on United States Highway 271, near Paris, Tex., on January 29, 1944. The court shall have such jurisdiction within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act, and the liability of the United States in any such suit shall be determined upon the same principles and measures of liability as in like cases between private individuals.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Orvis Welch, of Paris, Tex., the sum of \$4,523.45, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as the result of an accident involving a vehicle of the United States Army which occurred near Paris, Tex., on January 29, 1944: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Orvis Welch."

M. F. DILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2596) for the relief of M. F. Diller.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEONARD J. FOX AND MILFORD G. FOX

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3158) for the relief of Leonard J. Fox and Mil-

ford G. Fox, a partnership, doing business as Fox Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$9,058.32, to Leonard J. Fox and Milford G. Fox, a partnership, doing business as Fox Co., in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States under contracts Nos. W669-QM-19810 and W669-QM-2022, dated June 30, 1942, and July 16, 1942, respectively, entered into by Fox Co. with the United States Government through the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, United States Army, and providing for the manufacture of 250,000 badges, Army Award Work, and 300,000 badges and bars, such claim arising from a change in the purchase price of silver, established by the Office of Price Administration, with the concurrence of the State Department as follows: Subsequent to the dates of such contracts orders were placed by said Fox Co. with Handy & Harman Co. for 113,229 ounces of silver at 38½ cents per ounce. Following the placing of this order the price of silver was so changed by the action of the Office of Price Administration and the State Department that when it was delivered said Fox Co. was required to pay 46½ cents per ounce, resulting in a loss to claimants of \$9,058.32: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IDA F. BRAUN, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1782) for the relief of Ida F. Braun, Alice Braun Menges, and Carl J. Braun, individually and as executors of the estate of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as legatees and beneficiaries of the will of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and as the sole parties in interest by succession under the last will and testament of Hedwig W. Braun, deceased, and under the last will and testament of Herman W. Braun, deceased.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

GEORGE PATHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3573) for the relief of George Pathy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of subsection (b) of section 307 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1142; 8 U. S. C. 707), shall be held inapplicable to a petition for naturalization filed by George Pathy, an alien, who filed declaration of intention No. 539562 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, New York City, on April 29, 1943.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OGDEN AND DOUGHERTY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 815) for the relief of Ogden & Dougherty, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to certify for payment to Edwin Dougherty and M. H. Ogden, trading as Ogden & Dougherty, the sum of \$15,414.21, recommended by the United States district engineer at Cincinnati, Ohio, the division engineer at Columbus, Ohio, and the Chief of Engineers as the amount of just mathematical errors in the accepted bid submitted on January 7, 1941, by Ogden & Dougherty for the construction of a hospital building at Patterson Field, Dayton, Ohio, the exigencies of the military service being such as not to admit of delay necessary to correct the errors in the bid before the contract was entered into and the construction work commenced.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES ALVES SAUCIER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 831) for the relief of James Alves Saucier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Alves Saucier, of Poplarville, Miss., the sum of \$3,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Army truck at the Gulfport Army Airfield, Miss., on August 24, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSCAR S. REED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1077) for the relief of Oscar S. Reed.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Oscar S. Reed, of Auburndale, Mass., the sum of \$350, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him as a result of an accident which occurred when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a United States Navy vehicle, at Portsmouth, N. H., on August 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess

of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AFTAB ALI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1081) for the relief of Aftab Ali.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Aftab Ali, of New York, N. Y., the sum of \$500, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for the refund of a bail bond posted for Azir Khan, an alien, such bond having been forfeited on January 17, 1944, when the said Azir Khan failed to appear for deportation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANUEL ROSE LIMA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1101) for the relief of the estate of Manuel Rose Lima.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Manuel Rose Lima, of New Bedford, Mass., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of said Manuel Rose Lima, as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a United States Navy vehicle while walking on Washington Street, in Nantucket, Mass., on September 11, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: On page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLORENCE BARROWS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1142) for the relief of Florence Barrows.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Florence Barrows, of the town of Exeter, county of Kent, State of Rhode Island, the sum of \$2,500, in full settlement for personal injuries sustained by her on December 18, 1943, when she was injured by an Army truck, W-422452, operated by an enlisted man of the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WINTER BROS. CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1158) for the relief of Winter Bros. Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Winter Bros. Co., of Wrentham, Mass., the sum of \$2,400; the payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such company against the United States on account of losses sustained in the execution of Navy contract numbered NXsx-37041, for the supply of pipe taps, entered into by such company on September 13, 1943, such loss being due to a typographical error in the bid which, through a mutual mistake of fact by the contracting officer and the contractor, was not corrected in the signed contract: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL E. TACY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1231) for the relief of Paul E. Tacy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul E. Tacy, of Monterey, Calif., the sum of \$23.50, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for property damage sustained by him when his automobile was struck by a United States Army vehicle on Fountain Avenue, in Pacific Grove, Calif., on October 28, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. ALLAN F. WALKER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1294) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker, of Sepulveda, Calif., the sum of \$2,500 in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation for the death of their son, Dennis Allan Walker, who died as a result of burns received by him when a United States Army airplane crashed at 9363 Burnet Avenue, in Sepulveda, Calif., on January 25, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN A. HATCHER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1296) for the relief of John A. Hatcher.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$650, to John A. Hatcher, of Teays, W. Va., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Navy vehicle, near St. Albans, W. Va., on December 5, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess

of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM CARL JONES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1323) for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of William Carl Jones, of Merigold, Miss., the sum of \$3,551.99, in full satisfaction of the claims of such estate against the United States for compensation for the death of the said William Carl Jones as a result of gunshot wounds inflicted by a guard at the prisoner-of-war camp at Merigold, Miss., on March 24, 1945, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and funeral expenses incurred as a result of such injuries and death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BENALI EL OUKILI BOUCHETA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1360) to compensate Benali El Oukili Boucheta, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for the wrongful death of his son Mohamed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Oukili, near Marnia, Algeria, on September 30, 1944.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Benali El Oukili Boucheta, a resident and inhabitant of French Morocco, the sum of \$780 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States arising from the wrongful death near Marnia, Algeria, on September 30, 1944, of his son, Mohamed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Oukili: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEMENT EUZIERE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1361) to compensate Clement Euziere, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for personal injuries caused by a naval vehicle near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clement Euziere, a resident and inhabitant of French Morocco, the sum of \$2,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States arising from an accident occurring near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943, in which he sustained permanent injuries, to wit: the loss of his left leg at the level of the upper third of the thigh: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM WILSON WURSTER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1448) for the relief of William Wilson Wurster.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of William Wilson Wurster, San Francisco, Calif., on account of increased costs incurred by the said individual in the performance of his contract numbered WA-1194, dated January 9, 1942, with the Federal Works Agency, by reason of unavoidable delays on the part of other contractors and the Government in the construction and completion of a defense housing project at or near Sacramento, Calif., and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim the amount of not to exceed \$3,140. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$3,140, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the payment of the said claim: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES R. HOOPER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1480) for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles R. Hooper, of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$6,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Charles R. Hooper while employed in the United States navy yard at Washington, D. C., in the year 1894: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Strike out on page 1, line 3, the figure "\$6,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. G. SULLIVAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4752) for the relief of J. G. Sullivan.

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. MCGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LEWIS E. MAGWOOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4797) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to determine the claim of Lewis E. Magwood.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear and determine, and to render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, on the claim of Lewis E. Magwood, of Norfolk, Va., to recover damages for personal injuries sustained and expenses incurred by the said Lewis E. Magwood on account of a wound received while he was on duty on the tub Mars, which was towing targets during target practice of the Two Hundred and Fifty-second Coast Artillery, North Carolina National Guard, under the guidance and instruction of United States Army personnel, near Fort Moultrie, S. C., on August 3, 1932, if such suit is brought within 1 year after the enactment of this act.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the judgment, if any, rendered as the result of such suit, upon proper certification from the said United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3389) granting a pension to Anna Eleanor Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact, I am reliably informed, there have been no hearings on this bill, I ask unanimous consent it be referred to the committee for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand she is now a member of the United Nations Conference drawing a salary from the Federal Government of \$12,000 a year.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio has already answered that. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CITY OF MEMPHIS, TENN., AND MEMPHIS PARK COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (S. 176) for the relief of the city of Memphis, Tenn., and Memphis Park Commission.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, there is a very close legal question involved in this claim and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MABEL FOWLER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 845) for the relief of Mabel Fowler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 751-791), Carl F. Fowler, who was electrocuted on September 16, 1943, while seeking to correct failure of electric facilities at the Army air base near Mitchell, S. Dak., shall be deemed to have been a civil employee of the United States within the purview of said act, at the time of his death, and compensation for death shall be payable to Mabel Fowler, if she is found to be the widow of the said Carl F. Fowler, under the conditions provided in section 10 of such act of September 7, 1916, such compensation to be computed in the manner prescribed in said act upon the basis of \$175 as representing the monthly wage of the deceased at the time of his death. Any compensation for death received by said Mabel Fowler under any other workmen's compensation law shall be credited in such manner as the United States Employees' Compensation Commission may find to be just and equitable against any compensation which she may receive by reason of this act: *Provided,* That claim for compensation for death under such act shall be filed within 1 year from the approval of this act: *Provided further,* That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD E. BULLOCK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 905) for the relief of Harold E. Bullock.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harold E. Bullock, of Las Vegas, Nev., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his wife, Mrs. Harold E. Bullock, as a result of personal injuries sustained by her, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army vehicle on Highway No. 66, near Oro Grande, Calif., on July 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIE H. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1129) for the relief of Willie H. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Willie H. Johnson, Dunnellon, Fla., the sum of \$600 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him as the result of an accident which occurred in Dunnellon, Fla., on February 22, 1944, involving an Army vehicle: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$600" and insert in lieu thereof "\$350."

The amendment was agreed to

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF WAYNE EDWARD WILSON, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1338) for the relief of the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor, of Lebanon, Del., the sum of \$3,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said Wayne Edward Wilson, on August 28, 1944, and for reimbursement of medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him, as a result of his being burned when he came into contact with a cable hanging from a live electric wire, near Lebanon, Del., such cable having been dropped onto the electric wire from a United States Army airplane: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELI L. SCOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1721) for the relief of Eli L. Scott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Eli L. Scott, of Homewood, Ala., the sum of \$7,598.20, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital, and other expenses incurred as the result of a collision between the motorcycle he was driving and a United States Army vehicle at Homewood, Ala., on January 17, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. CONRAD NEWMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1783) for the relief of Conrad Newman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Conrad Newman, Muhlenberg County, Ky., the sum of \$7,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Conrad Newman against the United States on account of the death of his minor son, Jackie Glenn Newman, who was struck and killed by a United States Army truck operated under the direction of the post engineer of

Fort Knox, Ky., while its driver was dumping small rocks and gravel along Adair Street in Goldville, Fort Knox, Ky., on May 7, 1943.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$3,000."

Page 2, line 4, after "1943", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Conrad Newman."

ARTHUR A. GUARINO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2243) for the relief of Arthur A. Guarino.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EDWARD W. THURBER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2244) for the relief of Edward W. Thurber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,500, to Edward W. Thurber, in full compensation for injuries sustained and damages suffered by him as the result of an accident which occurred November 2, 1942, at Warwick, R. I., and which accident involved the operation of an airplane, the property of the United States Army, which said airplane was then and there being operated by a commissioned officer of the United States Army.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 5, strike out the figures "\$5,500" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$3,000."

Line 6, after the name "Thurber," strike out the remainder of the bill and insert "of Pawtuxet, R. I., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as the result of an accident which occurred on November 2, 1942, in Warwick, R. I., involving an Army airplane: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a

misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH O. MELLO AND ANTONIO MELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2246) for the relief of Joseph O. Mello and Antonio Mello as next of kin of Michael O. Mello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$20,000, to Joseph O. Mello and Antonio Mello, in full compensation because of the death of Michael O. Mello as a result of injuries sustained by him as a result of an accident which occurred on April 5, 1943, on Fall River Avenue in the town of Seekonk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which accident involved the operation of a motor vehicle the property of the United States Navy, which said motor vehicle was then and there being operated by an enlisted man of the United States Navy in the performance of his duties.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, after the sign "\$", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert "5,000 to the estate of Michael O. Mello, and to pay the sum of \$3,500 to Christian O. Mello, of Bristol, R. I., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said Michael O. Mello, and for personal injuries to Christian O. Mello sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States naval vehicle on April 5, 1943, in Seekonk, Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Michael O. Mello and Christian O. Mello."

JOSEPH TARANTOLA AND IDA TARANTOLA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2415) for the relief of Joseph Tarantola and Ida Tarantola.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$4,443 to Joseph Tarantola and Ida Tarantola, of St. Louis, Mo., in full settlement of all claims against the United States

as compensation for the death of Martha Tarantola, their daughter, who was killed as a result of an accident involving a United States Army jeep, on Arsenal Street, St. Louis, Mo., on February 9, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES SHERRY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2528) for the relief of James Sherry.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James Sherry, Sault St. Marie, Mich., the sum of \$20,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said James Sherry against the United States on account of the deaths of his three minor sons, James, John, and Peter Sherry, ages 12, 11, and 7, respectively, which were caused by the explosion on his farm near Brimley, in Chippewa County, Mich., on August 6, 1944, of a high explosive antitank rocket or bazooka projectile, which had been left on the Rexford rifle range by members of the United States Army on maneuvers.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 6, strike out the figures "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$12,500."

At the end of the bill add "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Sherry."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VENACIO CADIZ LLACUNA ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3670) for the relief of Venacio Cadiz Llacuna, In Sun Kwon, Sang Woon Kim, Matias Simon Miguel, Sabas Lagac Teanio, the legal guardian of Benjamin Ramelb, and the legal guardian of Santiago Sabado.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to

Venacio Cadiz Llacuna, of Waialua, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, father of Venacio Llacuna and Juan Llacuna, minors, the sum of \$10,000; to In Sun Kwon, of Waialua, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, father of Sung Ho Kwon, minor, the sum of \$5,000; to Sang Woon Kim, of Waialua, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, father of Fred Kim, a minor, the sum of \$5,000; to Matias Simon Miguel, of Waialua, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, father of Matias Miguel, Jr., a minor, the sum of \$5,000; to Sabas Lagac Teanio, of Waialua, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, father of Ernest Teanio, a minor, the sum of \$5,000; to the legal guardian of Benjamin Ramelb, a minor, the sum of \$5,000; and to the legal guardian of Santiago Sabado, a minor, the sum of \$5,000. Such sums are in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the deaths of Venacio Llacuna, Juan Llacuna, Sung Ho Kwon, Fred Kim, Matias Miguel, Jr., and Ernest Teanio, who were killed, and for personal injuries, hospital and medical expenses for Benjamin Ramelb and Santiago Sabado, who were injured as the result of an accident in which an Army vehicle struck this group of persons at Waialua, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, on July 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to" strike out the bill down to the colon in line 18, page 2, and insert in lieu thereof: "the estate of Venancio Llacuna, deceased, the sum of \$2,114.50; to the estate of Juan Llacuna, deceased, the sum of \$2,227; to the estate of Sung Ho Kwon, deceased, the sum of \$2,382.50; to the estate of Fred Kim, deceased, the sum of \$2,375.50; to the estate of Matias Miguel, Jr., deceased, the sum of \$2,341.40; to the estate of Ernest Teanio, deceased, the sum of \$2,554.50; to the legal guardian of Benjamin Ramelb, a minor, the sum of \$330.50; and to the legal guardian of Santiago Sabado, a minor, the sum of \$337, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the deaths of Venancio Llacuna, Juan Llacuna, Sung Ho Kwon, Fred Kim, Matias Miguel, Jr., and Ernest Teanio, deceased, and the medical hospital, and burial expenses incurred as a result of their injuries and deaths, and on account of personal injuries sustained by Benjamin Ramelb and Santiago Sabado and the medical and hospital expenses incurred on their behalf, all resulting from an accident involving an Army vehicle which occurred at Waialua, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, on July 2, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Venancio Llacuna and others."

MRS. BEATRICE BRISBIN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4253) for the relief of Mrs. Beatrice Brisbin, and the legal guardians of Wynona Gene Brisbin, Nelda Elaine Brisbin, Gwendoline Louise Brisbin, and Jacqueline Nadine Brisbin, minors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Beatrice Brisbin, of Holland, Tex., the wife of Chancie Lee Brisbin, deceased, the sum of \$10,000, and to the legal guardians of Wynona Gene Brisbin, a minor, the sum of \$5,000, Nelda Elaine Brisbin, a minor, the sum of \$5,000, Gwendoline Louise Brisbin, a minor, the sum of \$5,000, and Jacqueline Nadine Brisbin, a minor, the sum of \$5,000, each of said minors being the daughters of Chancie Lee Brisbin, deceased, and each residing at Holland, Tex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of the said Chancie Lee Brisbin on January 24, 1945, caused by a block of ice negligently thrown from a train by a soldier about 1 mile south of Holland, Tex., on the same date.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$3,313."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the figures "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,000."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,000."

Page 1, line 10, strike out the figures "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,000."

Page 2, line 1, strike out the figures "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,000."

At the end of bill add: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SIGURDUR JONSSON AND THOROLINA THORDARDOTTIR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 314) for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolína Thordardóttir.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jon Sigurdsson as attorney in fact for his parents, Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolína Thordardóttir, of Hafnarfjörður, Iceland, for and on their behalf, the sum of \$4,070.85, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son, Thordur Sigurdsson, who was fatally injured when shot by an enlisted soldier in the Army of the United States on November 8, 1941, at Hafnarfjörður, Iceland: *Provided,* That the claimants accept such sum in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their son.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services

rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT M. WIKLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 262) for the relief of Robert M. Wikle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert M. Wikle, Talladega, Ala., the sum of \$500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert M. Wikle against the United States on account of loss of rent with respect to a dwelling owned by him in Talladega, Ala., as the result of rent-control operations of the Office of Price Administration.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALVIN W. TWIGG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 804) for the relief of Alvin W. Twigg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alvin W. Twigg, Cumberland, Md., the sum of \$1,171.72. Such sum represents compensation in the sum of \$805, and allowances for equipment maintenance in the sum of \$366.72, which the said Alvin W. Twigg would have been paid by the Post Office Department for the period from May 1, 1926, to September 30, 1939, for services rendered as a rural carrier assigned to route No. 3, Cumberland, Md., if an error had not been made in measuring the length of such route.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "appropriated", strike out down to and including the word "route" page 2, line 3, and insert "the sum of \$529.69 to Mrs. Trixie Minnie Twigg, of Cumberland, Md., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for services rendered by her husband, Alvin W. Twigg, as a rural carrier assigned to route No. 3, Cumberland, Md., from May 1, 1926, to September 30, 1939: *Provided,* That no part of the

amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Trixie Minnie Twigg."

LANDER H. WILLIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 841) for the relief of Lander H. Willis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are waived in respect to the claim for compensation of Lander H. Willis, a rural mail carrier of the Post Office Department, Gray Court, S. C., for disability alleged to have resulted from an injury to his right hand on January 4, 1943, while in the performance of his duty, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized to receive, consider, and determine the merits of his claim when filed, under the remaining provisions of such act, but only if he files such claim with the Commission within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act. If the Commission finds that the claim of the said Lander H. Willis otherwise comes within the purview of such act, it shall pay to him in a lump sum within 60 days after such finding, in addition to any benefits to which he may be entitled after the date of enactment of this act, the total amount of monthly compensation to which he is entitled by reason of the enactment of this act for any period of disability prior to the date of enactment of this act, together with the medical expenses which have been necessarily incurred on account of such injury prior to such date.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "within 60 days."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HORTENSE ARNOW, J. M. ROGERS, AND MRS. WILLIE L. ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1037) for the relief of Mrs. Hortense Arnaw, J. M. Rogers, and Mrs. Willie L. Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Hortense Arnaw, Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of \$19,272.60; to J. M. Rogers, Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of \$6,967.50; and to Mrs. Willie L. Rogers, Jacksonville, Fla., the sum of \$6,-

917.20. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Hortense Arnow against the United States for damages on account of the death of her husband, for the destruction of his car, and for personal injuries to herself, and all claims of the said J. M. Rogers and his wife, Mrs. Willie L. Rogers, against the United States for damages for personal injuries to themselves, resulting from an accident which occurred on June 27, 1943, when the car in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck on the highway connecting Jacksonville with Jacksonville Beach, Fla.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Mrs. Hortense Arnow, J. M. Rogers, and Mrs. Willie L. Rogers, all of Jacksonville, Fla., for such damages sustained as the result of a collision between the car in which they were riding and a United States Army truck on the highway connecting Jacksonville with Jacksonville Beach, Fla.

"Sec 2. Such suit shall be brought in the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida, within 1 year of the date of approval of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court, Southern District of Florida."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. JOHN P. MAHER, FIELD ARTILLERY RESERVE, ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1264) for the relief of Lt. Col. John P. Maher, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$225, to Lt. Col. John P. Maher, Field Artillery Reserve, Army of the United States, of Brownsville, Tex., now on active service and stationed at West Point, N. Y., in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of the cost of transporting his three dependents from Brownsville, Tex., to West Point, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon

conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$225" and insert "\$201.74."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LUCY PALMISANO AND THE LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ANTHONY PALMISANO, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1399) for the relief of Mrs. Lucy Palmisano and the legal guardian of Anthony Palmisano, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$750 to Mrs. Lucy Palmisano, of Bayonne, N. J., and the sum of \$350 to the legal guardian of Anthony Palmisano, Jr., of Bayonne, N. J. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Lucy Palmisano and the legal guardian of Anthony Palmisano, Jr., against the United States for injuries sustained on May 10, 1944, when a Navy truck struck Mrs. Palmisano and Anthony Palmisano, Jr., while they were crossing Hudson County Boulevard at Forty-ninth Street, Bayonne, N. J.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$750" and insert "\$350."

Line 7, strike out "\$350" and insert "\$200."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARIE A. SHEDD, MRS. MAUDE C. DENNEY, MRS. MABEL GLENN GRAY, AND MRS. RUTH C. SHEDD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1732) for the relief of Mrs. Marie A. Shedd, Mrs. Maude C. Denney, Mrs. Mabel Glenn Gray, and Mrs. Ruth C. Shedd for injuries sustained when an Army truck was in collision with the car in which they were riding.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marie A. Shedd, the sum of \$15,235.61; to Mrs. Maude C. Denney, the sum of \$5,666.60; to Mrs. Mabel Glenn Gray, the sum of \$3,267.24; and to Mrs. Ruth C. Shedd, the sum of \$581, for injuries sustained by them when an Army truck was in collision with the car in which they were riding.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "Shedd", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert "1132 Stearns Drive, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$5,798.30, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of her daughter, Miss Sybil Shedd; to Mrs. Maude C. Denney, of 1211 North Stevens Avenue, El Paso, Tex., the sum of \$4,578.41, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained and for medical, hospital, nursing, and incidental expenses and loss of earnings incurred; and to Mrs. Mabel Glenn Gray, of 4020 Trowbridge Street, El Paso, Tex., the sum of \$3,267.24, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained and for medical, hospital, and incidental expenses and loss of earnings incurred, resulting from an accident involving an Army vehicle in El Paso, Tex., on January 21, 1944."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie A. Shedd, Mrs. Maude C. Denney, and Mrs. Mabel Glenn Gray."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1950) for the relief of Harry Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$161 to Harry Cohen, of 76 Suffolk Street, Malden, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and medical expenses as a result of a collision between the Dodge truck in which he was a passenger and a United States Navy truck, in South Boston, Mass., on March 13, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF J. EARL EVANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2011) for the relief of the estate of J. Earl Evans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of J. Earl Evans, of Carroll County, Mo., the sum of \$6,143.63, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as compensation for the death of J. Earl Evans and funeral expenses incident thereto sustained as the result of his being struck by a United States Army ambulance in the 1700 block of North Capitol Street, Washington, D. C., on November 17, 1942:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$6,148.63" and insert "\$4,248.63."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WESLEY A. MANGELSDORF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2480) for the relief of Wesley A. Mangelsdorf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$18,270, to Wesley Mangelsdorf, of San Francisco, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and other losses sustained as a result of a collision between the car in which he was riding and the United States Coast Guard truck on the Bayshore Highway just about the northerly limits of Redwood City, Calif., on March 9, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out "\$18,270" and insert "\$9,000."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to the committee amendment: Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$9,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN S. WINGATE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2786) for the relief of John S. Wingate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JAMES HAROLD NESBITT, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2843) for the relief of the legal guardian of James Harold Nesbitt, a minor.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THERESE R. COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2956) for the relief of Therese R. Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Therese R. Cohen, Brooklyn, N. Y., the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by the said Therese R. Cohen, resulting from her being thrown from a United States Navy truck on April 14, 1944, on the grounds of the Floyd Bennett Naval Air Station, Brooklyn, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$7,500."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER as an amendment to the committee amendment: On page 1, line 6, strike out the sum "\$7,500" and insert "\$5,000."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY G. PAUL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3003) for the relief of Mary G. Paul.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Mary G. Paul, Albuquerque, N. Mex., and her claim for compensation for disability resulting from her having contracted tuberculosis while employed as a nurse at the Veterans' Administration, Alexandria, La., is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon

under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended; as if she had filed notice of injury and claim for compensation for disability within the time prescribed by such sections 17 and 20, but only if she files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out the words "17 and 20" and insert "15 to 20, inclusive."

Line 10, page 1, after the word "disability" strike out "allegedly."

Page 2, line 1, after the word "nurse", strike out the balance of the line and all of line 2, and insert "by the Veterans' Administration, at facilities of such Administration, between April 1926 and June 13, 1944."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "17 and 20" and insert "15 to 20, inclusive."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID SISKIND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3050) for the relief of David Siskind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David Siskind, of New York City, the sum of \$2,142.68, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injury, medical expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of a collision between the taxicab he was driving and a United States Navy jeep, June 14, 1944, at Madison Avenue and Forty-eighth Street, New York City: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,142.68" and insert "\$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH M. SIMMONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3121) for the relief of Elizabeth M. Simmons and Robert H. Simmons.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elizabeth M. Simmons and Robert H. Simmons, of Owensboro, Ky., the sum of \$1,034.65, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for damages for personal injuries and medical expenses sustained by

Elizabeth M. Simmons when she fell while descending the steps, which were in a chipped and broken condition, from the south entrance of the post office building at Owensboro, Ky., on April 26, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JEAN TAUBE WELLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3126) for the relief of Mrs. Jean Taube Weller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000, to Mrs. Jean Taube Weller, 334 McClellan Street, Schenectady, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as the result of an accident involving an Army vehicle at approximately the intersection of Meta Street (also known as Highway 101) and Oak Street, in Ventura, Calif., on June 20, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY F. VINTON, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3127) for the relief of Harry F. Vinton, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry F. Vinton, Jr., of Braintree, Mass., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him, as a result of being struck by a United States Navy truck on March 6, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

XCH—58

sions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERNEST PEDRO FERREIRA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3159) for the relief of Ernest Pedro Ferreira.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ernest Pedro Ferreira, Honolulu, T. H., the sum of \$3,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Ernest Pedro Ferreira against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on April 16, 1942, when the truck on which he was employed as a helper was struck in the rear while standing in a line of traffic on North King Street, Honolulu, T. H., by a United States Army truck which had, in turn, been struck in the rear by a second United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES J. BARRETT, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3177) for the relief of James J. Barrett, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James J. Barrett, Jr., aviation radioman first class, United States Naval Reserve, the sum of \$110.55. Such sum represents reimbursement for transportation of his wife, Dorothy M. Barrett, from San Diego, Calif., to Philadelphia, Pa., incident to his change of station from San Diego, Calif., to Carrier Aircraft Service Unit 47.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "sum", strike out the balance of the line and down to and including the word "47", on line 1, page 2, and insert "shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement of transportation cost of his wife, Dorothy M. Barrett, from San Diego, Calif.,

to Philadelphia, Pa., incident to his change of station from San Diego, Calif., to Carrier Aircraft Service Unit 47: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEN. WILLIAM J. WILLIAMSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3261) for the relief of Gen. William J. Williamson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. MCGREGOR objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

JAMES HERBERT KEITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3301) for the relief of the legal guardian of James Herbert Keith, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of James Herbert Keith, a minor, of Cedar Springs, Ky., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said James Herbert Keith on March 23, 1945, as the result of the explosion of a dynamite cap left in an abandoned shack which had been constructed by the Works Progress Administration at Cedar Springs, Ky., in or about the year 1936, in connection with a road-construction project: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE F. POWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3430) for the relief of George F. Powell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the

Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000, to George F. Powell, of Success, Mo., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, hospital expenses, and loss of earnings as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle, near Fort Leonard Wood, Mo., on December 16, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

F. W. BURTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3431) for the relief of F. W. Burton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to F. W. Burton, of Decatur, Tex., the sum of \$216.90, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for servicing vehicles of the Three Hundred and Ninety-fifth Infantry, United States Army, while on maneuvers near Decatur, Tex., on June 20, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELMER D. THOMPSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3543) for the relief of Elmer D. Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elmer D. Thompson, of Gurley, Ala., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, sustained by his minor son, James Thompson, as a result of being struck by a United States Army vehicle on or about February 2, 1944, on United States Highway No. 17, in front of Crofts Grocery Store, in Windermere, Charleston, S. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$1,118.75."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "injuries," insert "medical and hospital expenses."

Page 1, line 10, after the word "on" strike out "or about."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of James Thompson, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES BROWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3590) for the relief of Charles Brown and the legal guardian of Lula Mae Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Brown, Albany, La., the sum of \$1,030, and to the legal guardian of Lula Mae Brown, a minor, Albany, La., the sum of \$1,618. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said Charles Brown and Lula Mae Brown on December 20, 1944, in New Orleans, La., when a United States Navy truck knocked an iron post from its foundation, causing such post to strike the said Charles Brown and Lula Mae Brown: *Provided*, That no part of either of the sums appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim settled by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,030" and insert "\$500."

Page 1, line 7, after the words "the sum of" strike out the balance of the line, all of lines 8 and 9, down to and including the words "Mae Brown" in line 5, page 2, and insert "\$500; to Charity Hospital of New Orleans, La., the sum of \$28; to Dr. Edward H. Maurer, of New Orleans, La., the sum of \$30; in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained on December 20, 1944, when a United States Navy truck knocked an iron post from its foundation, causing said post to strike said Charles Brown and Lula Mae Brown, in New Orleans, La."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Charles Brown, legal guardian of Lula Mae Brown; Charity Hospital of New Orleans, La.; and Dr. Edward H. Maurer."

H. A. EDD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4054) for the relief of H. A. Edd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to H. A. Edd, fiscal agent, emergency rubber project, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$290, to reimburse him for repayment of this amount to the credit of the appropriation "Emergency Rubber Project, Department of Agriculture (F. S.), 1942-43", covered by certificate of deposit 12-229, dated January 26, 1945, accounts of G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, symbol 115-8750, on account of cost of shipment of the household goods of Dr. C. A. Muller on transfer of station from Washington, D. C., to San Antonio, Tex., said shipment having been made after expiration of the 6-month period within which shipment was authorized to be made: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MABEL R. WOODFALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4176) for the relief of Mabel R. Woodfall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mabel R. Woodfall, Braintree, Mass., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mabel R. Woodfall against the United States on account of the death of her son, Earle R. Woodfall, Jr., who died from injuries received on May 21, 1943, while riding in a bus, owned and operated by the Motor Transportation Division of the Panama Canal. Such bus, while en route from Gamboa to Balboa, Canal Zone, was struck by a bulldozer which extended over the left side of a trailer truck on which it was loaded. Such trailer truck was owned and operated by the Municipal Engineering Division of the Panama Canal: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "to," strike out the balance of line 5, all of lines 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 down to and including the word "Canal" in line 6, on page 2, and insert "the estate of Earle R. Woodfall, Jr., deceased, the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Earle R.

Woodfall, Jr., from injuries sustained on May 21, 1943, when the Government bus in which he was riding from Gamboa to Balboa, C. Z., was involved in an accident with a trailer truck owned and operated by the Municipal Engineering Division of the Panama Canal."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER to the committee amendment:

Page 2, line 7, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,200."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Earle R. Woodfall, Jr., deceased."

JAMES R. VAUGHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3828) for the relief of James R. Vaughan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000, to James R. Vaughan, of Henderson, Tenn., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained as the result of a collision involving a United States Army truck at the intersection of United States Highway No. 45 and West Main Street, Henderson, Tenn., on December 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BEULAH HART

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 916) for the relief of Mrs. Beulah Hart.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MAJ. EDWARD A. ZAJ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1980) for the relief of Maj. Edward A. Zaj.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Maj. Edward A. Zaj, United States Army, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States any amount for which he is accountable, on the

date of enactment of this act, because of the loss through theft during the invasion of Sicily of \$1,900 in United States invasion currency which had been entrusted to his care. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Maj. Edward A. Zaj so much of such sum of \$1,900 as has been refunded to the United States by him, through deductions from his pay or otherwise, prior to the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FATHER PETER B. DUFFEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1238) for the relief of Father Peter B. Duffee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to pay, out of sums appropriated for the Medical Department of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Department of the Navy, to Father Peter B. Duffee such sum as will reimburse him for all hospital and medical expenses incurred prior to the expiration of 10 days after the date of enactment of this act as the result of personal injuries sustained by him in the rescue of persons from the steamship *Lafayette* (formerly the *Normandie*) and in the performance of other services during the burning of such vessel.

Sec. 2. Until such time as the said Father Peter B. Duffee is fully recovered from the effects of the injuries sustained by him in the burning of the *Lafayette*, he shall be entitled, without expense to him, to such care, maintenance, and treatment in any naval or other hospital under the jurisdiction or control of the Department of the Navy as he may require on account of such injuries.

Sec. 3. As used in this act, the term "injuries" includes any disease contracted by the said Father Peter B. Duffee as the result of the heroic services rendered by him during the burning of the *Lafayette*.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "vessel", insert "not to exceed the sum of \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORGAN CREAMERY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4435) for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$395.37, withheld from money due from the United States Government to the Morgan Creamery Co., Fargo, N. Dak., and that the Veterans' Administration's claim of \$920.64 against the Morgan Creamery Co. be canceled. The said claim arising out of the excess cost alleged to have been incurred by the Veterans' Administration by reason of the failure of the Morgan Creamery Co., to perform under contract No. VA37r-935,

entered into on June 25, 1942, with the United States Veterans' Administration to deliver fresh milk, cream, buttermilk, and cottage cheese to the Veterans' Administration facilities, Fargo, N. Dak., during the fiscal year that ended June 30, 1943. The facts are that the Morgan Creamery Co. discontinued the delivery of said products in accordance with a direction and agreement on the part of the Veterans' Administration facilities at Fargo, N. Dak.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof: "That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to allow the sum of \$395.37 in full settlement of the claim of the Morgan Creamery Co., Fargo, N. Dak., under contract No. VA37r-935 entered into on June 25, 1942, with the Veterans' Administration for furnishing dairy products to the Veterans' Administration facility, Fargo, N. Dak., during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and the said company is hereby relieved of all liability to the United States on account of excessive cost incurred by reason of its default under the said contract. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$395.37 for payment of claim."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUTCHINSON'S BOAT WORKS, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1217) for the relief of Hutchinson's Boat Works, Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hutchinson's Boat Works, Inc., Alexandria Bay, N. Y., the sum of \$6,842.06. Such sum represents the actual loss incurred by the said Hutchinson's Boat Works, Inc., in the performance of a contract with the Department of the Navy (contract NXs 3819) for the construction of five buoy boats. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising from the performance of such contract.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert "\$4,468.12; to First National Bank of Merrick, Merrick, N. Y., assignee of Amity Boat Basin, the sum of \$13,855.58; to Brun-Kimball & Co., of Patchogue, N. Y., the sum of \$17,297.85; to Mount Desert Boat Yard, Inc., of Mount Desert, Maine, the sum of \$1,299.84; to Channel Boat Co., of Newport Beach, Calif., the sum of \$9,822.94; to Fair Haven Yacht Works, of Fair Haven, N. J., the sum of \$14,448.95; to Harbor Boat Works, of San Diego, Calif., the sum of \$17,523.83;

to San Pedro Boat Works, of San Pedro, Calif., the sum of \$117,205.62; to Reed Bros., of Boothbay Harbor, Maine, the sum of \$12,686.71; to S. B. Norton & Son, of Dark Harbor, Maine, the sum of \$5,120.78. Such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained as the result of certain contracts made between the said companies and the United States Navy for building small boats, referred to as 'buoy boats'; *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Hutchinson's Boat Works, Inc., and others."

GRAVES BLANCHARD ERSKINE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1590) to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of the act of July 31, 1894, as amended (5 U. S. C. Annotated 62), or any other provisions of law, the President, acting by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint Maj. Gen. Graves Blanchard Erskine, a general officer in the United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, and Major General Erskine's appointment to, acceptance of, and service in that office shall in no way affect any status, office, rank, or grade he may occupy or hold in the United States Marine Corps or any component thereof or any emolument, perquisite, right, privilege, or benefit incident to or arising out of any such status, office, rank, or grade: *Provided*, That so long as he holds the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, Major General Erskine shall retain the rank and grade of major general which he now holds in the United States Marine Corps and he shall receive the pay and allowances payable to an officer serving on active duty with the rank and in the grade of major general in the United States Marine Corps, or any component thereof; and in the event the salary prescribed by law for the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator exceeds such pay and allowances, Major General Erskine shall receive directly from the Department of Labor the difference between such pay and allowances and such salary.

SEC. 2. In the performance of his duties as Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, Major General Erskine shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (naval or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were in no way connected with the United States Marine Corps, or any component thereof.

SEC. 3. The appropriations of the Department of Labor shall be available for reim-

bursement to the Marine Corps of all pay and allowances received by Major General Erskine from the Marine Corps or its agencies while he is serving as Retraining and Reemployment Administrator.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. MARION M. HILL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 991) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill, of Wheeler, Ala., the sum of \$4,175 in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their minor son, Arless Atchely Hill, as a result of personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a Government-owned vehicle driven by an employee of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the performance of his official duties, near Wheeler, Ala., on December 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM C. REESE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3085) for the relief of William C. Reese.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER and Mr. DOLLIVER objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. MAY HOLLAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5010) for the relief of Mrs. May Holland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. May Holland, Cape May, N. J., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. May Holland against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Leslie W. Holland, who was fatally injured on September 2, 1942, when the bicycle he was riding on State Highway Route No. 4, near Cape May, N. J., was struck by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the figure "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$5,529."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "truck," insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING AN HONORABLE DISCHARGE TO WILLIAM ROSENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1616) to grant an honorable discharge from the military service of the United States to William Rosenberg.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an honorable discharge be granted to William Rosenberg, Army serial No. 6041837, for the period of an enlistment in the United States Army extending from July 8, 1916, to December 26, 1917, said discharge to supplement the pardon granted by the President of the United States under date of February 2, 1918.

SEC. 2. That, upon request, the Secretary of War shall grant to William Rosenberg, Army serial No. 6041837, a discharge certificate showing that he is held and considered to have been honorably discharged under the provisions of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out everything after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers or their dependents, William Rosenberg shall hereafter be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a private of Company M, Forty-ninth Infantry, on the 26th day of December 1917: *Provided*, That no bounty, back pay, pension, or allowance shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of William Rosenberg."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF THE ALLOTMENT OF HENRY KEISER ON THE CROW INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 480) to authorize the sale of the allotment of Henry Keiser on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, upon the

application of Henry Keiser in writing, to offer for sale to the highest bidder, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, the allotment of Henry Keiser, Crow Indian allottee No. 3313, described as lots 11 and 12 of section 3, west half of section 10, township 2 south, range 30 east, and southwest quarter northwest quarter, northwest quarter southwest quarter, south half southwest quarter, and southeast quarter of section 1, township 8 south, range 37 east, principal meridian, Big Horn County, Mont., containing seven hundred and eighteen and seventy-five one hundredths acres: *Provided*, That such part of the proceeds received from the sale of said land as the Secretary of the Interior may deem advisable shall be reinvested in other lands selected by said Henry Keiser, and such land so selected and purchased shall not be alienated or encumbered without the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and shall be nontaxable and such restrictions shall appear in the conveyance. The balance of such proceeds, if any, shall be deposited to the credit of Henry Keiser and shall be expended under individual Indian money regulations of the Department of the Interior.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING SALE OF THE ALLOTMENT OF LEROY MILLIKEN ON THE CROW INDIAN RESERVATION, MONT.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4027) authorizing sale of the allotment of LeRoy Milliken on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, upon the application of LeRoy Milliken in writing, to offer for sale to the highest bidder, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe, the following-described lands allotted to said LeRoy Milliken: The south half of the south half of the north half of the northeast quarter, the south half of the northeast quarter, the southeast quarter of the northwest quarter, the east half of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter, of section 24, township 5 south, range 26 east, the north half of the northeast quarter, the southeast quarter of the northeast quarter, and the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, of section 25, township 5 south, range 26 east, and lots 4, 9, and 10 of section 19, township 5 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF A PATENT IN FEE TO ALICE YARLOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4034) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Alice Yarlott.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue Alice Yarlott Othermedicine, a Crow Indian allottee, a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to her on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The north-

west quarter of the southwest quarter, section 11, township 9 south, range 34 east, Montana principal meridian, Big Horn County, Mont., containing 40 acres.

With the following committee amendments:

In line 7 of the bill strike out the word "southwest" and substitute therefor "southeast."

Correct the name "Alice Yarlott" in the title and in line 4 of the bill to "Alice Yarlott Othermedicine."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Alice Yarlott Othermedicine."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO WILBUR KEISER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4035) authorizing the issuance of a patent fee to Wilbur Keiser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Wilbur Keiser a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: Lot 4 and the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of section 2, and the west half of the northwest quarter of section 11, township 3 north, range 31 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 157.2 acres.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Wilbur" and insert "Wilbert."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "two-tenths" and insert "twenty-two one-hundredths."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Wilbert Keiser."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HERMAN GELB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4957) for the relief of Herman Gelb.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Herman Gelb, of New York City, N. Y., the sum of \$500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States by said Herman Gelb on account of the injuries sustained by him when the automobile in which he was a passenger was struck by a War Department jeep on October 15, 1943, in Jersey City, N. J.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor

and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MINERVA C. DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5167) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis.

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

FLAG OF CHURCH OF GOD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5258) granting a renewal of Patent No. 113244 dated February 7, 1939, relating to the flag of the Church of God.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a certain design patent issued by the United States Patent Office of date of February 7, 1939, being Patent No. 113244, relating to the flag of the Church of God, is hereby renewed and extended for a period of 14 years from and after the date of enactment of this act with all the rights and privileges pertaining to the same.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON FULL EMPLOYMENT BILL

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill S. 380, the so-called full employment bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us when he is going to bring that conference report up for consideration?

Mr. MANASCO. I think it will be brought up tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, if the conference report is filed today, it will be brought up the first thing tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MRS. CELIA ELLEN ASHCRAFT

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1085), for the relief of Mrs. Celia Ellen Ashcraft, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "Mrs. Celia Ellen Ashcraft, of Clinton, Okla., formerly of Gore, Okla." and insert "the estate of Edwin Perry Ashcraft."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Mrs. Celia Ellen Ashcraft" and insert "estate."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "her husband."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the estate of Edwin Perry Ashcraft."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHERINE BODE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2223), for the relief of Catherine Bode, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, MORRISON, and PITTENGER.

MRS. S. P. BURTON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2487) for the relief of Mrs. S. P. Burton, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, COMES, and JENNINGS.

HARRIET TOWNSEND BOTTOMLEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2267), for the relief of Harriet Townsend Bottomley with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. McGEHEE, KEOGH, and CASE of New Jersey.

ESTATE OF PETER G. FABIAN, DECEASED

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 1890, for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted

by the Senate amendment, insert "\$3,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1890) for the relief of the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The bill as passed by the House appropriated the sum of \$2,423.75 to the estate of Peter G. Fabian, deceased, for his death, hospital, medical, and funeral expenses incident thereto, as a result of being struck by a United States Army jeep in Rochester, N. Y., on June 14, 1944. The Senate increased the amount to \$5,423.75, and at the conference a compromise of \$3,500 was agreed upon.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
E. H. HEDRICK,
JOHN W. BYRNES,
Managers on the Part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article that appeared in the New York Times.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article that appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, of Lynn, Mass., a very complimentary statement on the United States attorney at Boston, Mass.; in the other to include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. WORLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from George Schaeffer, of Happy, Tex.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include several telegrams from people in New Hampshire and in New England.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request of yesterday to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include copy of the Montana War Finance Report. Mr. Speaker, I have received an estimate from the Public Printer that this will cost \$121.40, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include letters from constituents.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Bristol Courier and in the other an editorial appearing in the St. Marys Daily Press.

APPOINTMENT OF FACT-FINDING BOARDS TO INVESTIGATE LABOR DISPUTES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4908, with Mr. O'NEAL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROSSION]. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided; and there were—ayes 33, noes 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNET of New York to the Case amendment: On page 11, after section 9, line 21, insert a new subsection, section 9 (a):

"SEC. 9. (a) It shall be the further duty of the Board to make a broad and comprehensive study of the field of labor-management relations from the viewpoint of both labor, industry, and the public to determine what adjustments are necessary to promote continuity and regularity of employment, industrial peace, and the uninterrupted production and distribution of goods and services for commerce. The Board shall make its final report to the President and to the Congress, including recommendations with respect to legislation, not later than June 30, 1946."

Mr. BENNET of New York. Mr. Chairman, for over a year I have been attending sessions of this body and have listened to many debates on the problems of labor and management. As a result, I have come to the conclusion that there are a handful of Members who will support anything desired by organized labor regardless of its merits and that there is another handful who will oppose anything which they believe is favored by labor.

However, I am equally convinced that the vast majority of the membership is neither pro-labor nor anti-labor, but sincerely desires to reach a solution of these problems which will improve the chances for uninterrupted production by our industries and thus avoid the terrific economic losses to all classes of our people caused by strikes.

In trying to accomplish this result, however, the membership is handicapped as it is in so many other fields, by the lack of adequate, disinterested advice, including specific recommendations.

We cannot rely upon the Department of Labor for that Department invariably and frankly takes labor's side of the argument. We cannot rely upon organized labor for it represents only a frac-

tion of the people employed in this country and what its leaders want will not always promote the interests of other workers.

Furthermore—labor leaders, as far as I can judge from my correspondence and telegrams, content themselves with denouncing pending legislative efforts to deal with the labor problem, but suggest no legislation of their own. They do not seem to realize that the people of the country and most Members of Congress want some form of legislation adopted and do not believe that all labor disputes should be settled solely by the participants and without regard to the general public.

We cannot rely upon management for help because management too often relies upon efforts to paint labor leaders as Communists, or worse, and is as much at fault as organized labor in failing to recommend constructive legislation.

The amendment which I have proposed differs from any of the legislation thus far submitted on this subject in that it does not limit the powers of the Board created by the so-called Case bill to the handling of specific labor disputes, but instead, charges the Board with the responsibility of studying the underlying causes of industrial disputes and recommending to the Congress permanent, forward-looking legislation calculated to reduce to a minimum the number of labor-management disturbances.

If this amendment is adopted the Congress will have for the first time its own creation to which it can look for well informed, disinterested advice and specific recommendations.

The Board will be empowered, under this amendment, to study and comment upon the various profit-sharing plans now in operation in various industries. It will be enabled to study, analyze, and summarize the Trade Disputes Act adopted by Great Britain which appears to have worked successfully.

Under the terms of the amendment the Board will be directed to make its report to the Congress by June 30, 1946, and the Congress would then have before it, following its return from the summer recess, a well-digested and documented summary of the entire labor-management relations field, specific suggestions for curing the ills which actually exist, and convincing reasons for each of the recommendations given, based upon actual experience either in our country or elsewhere.

This amendment has not been hastily drawn and submitted at the last minute. It is the result of the labors of several Republican Members of Congress who have been meeting off and on for the past 2 or 3 weeks in an effort to make some lasting contribution toward the difficult task of helping American industry to operate at maximum efficiency which it must do if we are to have steady employment for the greatest possible number of Americans.

I voted for the rule bringing the fact-finding bill on the floor for debate for various reasons, but was guided largely

by my belief that in so doing I could get before the House at an early date the amendment which I have now introduced and which I hope will be supported by every Member who is anxious to have the Seventy-ninth Congress, before the end of its life, enact legislation which will promote domestic peace which in the long run is even more vital to us than world peace.

If this amendment is adopted and the Board's recommendation are laid before the Congress on or before June 30 we may possibly adopt legislation of that nature. At least, we shall then have the opportunity of doing so.

Under present conditions as has been well evidenced by the current debate we can only hope to produce a hodgepodge bill adopted in haste in an effort to meet popular clamor and without any guidance, except from those who have axes to grind.

Probably it will be helpful to the morale of the country for us to do this if only as an indication of the fact that Congress does not fear nor hesitate to legislate in this field. But, whether anything more lasting than that would be accomplished it would be difficult to say.

I earnestly hope that everyone who wishes to seek a permanent solution and to equip Congress on this subject at least with the kind of machinery it ought to have on all subjects will support this amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that with the explanation the gentleman has given it will now be helpful to reread the amendment. The gentleman proposes to offer a short paragraph following section 9 of the Case bill to read as follows:

It shall be the further duty of the Board to make a broad and comprehensive study of the field of labor-management relations from the viewpoint of both labor, industry, and the public to determine what adjustments are necessary to promote continuity and regularity of employment, industrial peace, and the uninterrupted production and distribution of goods and services for commerce. The Board shall make its final report to the President and to the Congress, including recommendations with respect to legislation, not later than June 30, 1946.

Personally, I see no objection to the amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. This amendment raises the question in my mind as to what function, if any, our Department of Labor and Department of Commerce perform in our Federal operation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Apparently the gentleman who offered the amendment has some doubts on that score. So he desires to have this study made and a report by a fixed date.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is this not the duty of the two Departments to which I have referred?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It may be their duty, but several Members have

mentioned the need for such a study. Possibly it should be said that this directive is more specific than the general powers they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDIS: On pages 14 and 15 of the Case amendment, strike out section 13.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just introduced strikes out section 13. Section 10 makes an attempt to take a man to court and probably an attempt to put him in jail. Then we turn right around in section 13 and make an attempt again to put him in jail for the same offense. I understand section 13 is to eliminate jurisdictional strikes. I understand that a jurisdictional strike is a strike between two different unions or between two crafts in a union. A breach of contract is a jurisdictional strike. A wildcat strike, an outlaw strike, or a sympathy strike are similar. Now, if you have taken care of jurisdictional strikes in section 10, why repeat in section 13?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Might it not be possible that one of these strikes that are covered in section 13 might be carried on where there was not a no-strike provision in the contract? Hence, there would be no issue of a violation of contract. I just raise that question for the purpose of clarifying the matter.

Mr. LANDIS. Of course, you have the penalty for breach of contract in any collective-bargaining agreement. I understand that.

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. May I say to the gentleman I am delighted to see him offer this amendment? I intend to vote for it. I hope the Members on this side of the aisle who want to vote for some sort of constructive bill will help to perfect this Case amendment by joining with the gentleman from Indiana in supporting the deletion of section 13.

Mr. LANDIS. I realize, of course, that the employer does not have anything to say about jurisdictional disputes or strikes because that involves a difference between two unions or between the crafts of any union. But this penalty is taken care of in section 10.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I think section 13 goes a good deal further than simply attacking matters of jurisdictional strikes. Here is the word "boycott," for instance. The paragraph starts with the words "boycott, and so forth." Now, the words "boycott, and so forth" in any dispute can mean nearly anything.

The word "boycott" has an accepted implication that in a way means organizations to prevent the sale of some certain commodities. But in this bill these words have a different meaning. Under the language in the present bill it can include persons who are not connected even remotely with any strike. We are here considering legislation designed to prevent strikes and to assist in the settlement of strikes. I think we should stick close to the real purpose which we seek to accomplish.

Mr. LANDIS. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have now arrived at that point in the consideration of this bill when the effort to sabotage it, sterilize it, and caponize it is now beginning to show itself. This is the boycott provision of this bill. There are many Members who have been asked by farm organizations to support this bill. The reason is that this is one tooth in this bill which will stop this outrageous business of labor organizations refusing to permit the products of the farms to go to market. We might just as well face this thing now. Do not be deceived by this effort to strike out this provision in the bill. It is the very meat, the very heart of the bill, as far as the agriculture of this Nation is concerned.

Let me read a telegram I have just received from California. Some of our friends from California who pretend to be here in support of the lawful rights of their farmers and their fruit raisers ought to take a little interest in this matter if they really mean to do something for their friends.

Here is an extract from a telegram I received from California this morning:

In this State AFL teamsters' unions are refusing to move products to and from canneries because CIO has bargaining rights under Wagner Act. These products are perishable. Last week manager and assistant manager in Penney store in suburbs Los Angeles beaten up, seriously injured, skulls fractured, because they attempted to open up their store—

And so forth. Let us not be under any misapprehension about this thing. Vote to sterilize this bill, vote to cut all the vitals out of it, if you want to, but do not let anybody deceive you into thinking you are doing something that amounts to anything, because if you proceed as you have started this morning with this bill you will wind up with an empty gesture which will accomplish nothing more than to deceive the people of the United States into believing you have done something about labor-union abuses, as a matter of fact, we know, if we read the bill, we will not have done anything. I appeal to you to give this ample debate and ample consideration before you take this first step to remove all the teeth from this bill.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LANDIS. Section 11 takes care of violence and intimidation, and the Hobbs

antiracketeering bill takes care of some of the other things the gentleman has spoken about.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But this is the only section in this bill which takes care of the proposition where your farmers are denied the right to move their stuff to market. All you have got to do is to look at the hearings held before the Committee on the Judiciary on this subject. They are voluminous. There are pictures there showing where carloads of lemons have been boycotted and permitted to rot on the railroads, and scooped out with steam shovels. You Members know about this thing. Is there any Member from any farm area who does not know that his farmers are being discriminated against in having their products excluded from the markets and permitted to rot on the vines? You know it. Let us not fool ourselves about this thing. Let us do something or let us do nothing. If you are not going to do anything, let us vote against the whole business, but let us not fool the people of America any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia just assumes that section 13 in this bill which follows legislation he has heretofore sponsored is the only legislation we can adopt that will accomplish the committee's purpose. He has no monopoly on opposition to violence, to unfair picketing, to the denial of the right of a man to work. Some of us on this side are just as earnest, some of us on this side are just as sincere. I will not say we know as much about it as he does, but we know something about it.

The issue is not whether or not we want legislation against strikes and violence; everyone wants that; the issue is how can we get it without harm to the right of collective bargaining, without harm to the general public. My farmers have been cut off from the markets just as much as have been the farmers down here in Alexandria and we have spoken about it on the floor a good many times. Only recently the teamsters' union, to which he makes reference, shut off the groceries, closed the grocery stores, some of them in my district, by refusing to handle goods from warehouses. To end that practice by the teamsters' union H. R. 5202 and H. R. 5203 were introduced.

If this amendment is defeated I propose to offer an amendment which has been on the Speaker's desk since yesterday and which has to do with the interstate handling of merchandise, which strikes from section 13 that provision which gives the courts the right to issue injunctions. I do not believe that provision necessary and yesterday you will recall that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VOYTS] offered another amendment to one section which was adopted by the House which denied the authority of the courts to issue injunctions.

The amendment which I propose to offer applies principally to those who are engaged for hire in moving goods in interstate commerce and prohibits violence, secondary and boycott strikes, which is something most of us want. I

hope to have an opportunity to vote on that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, with section 13 stricken from the bill, as far as I am concerned, it is no bill.

If we want to do anything to curb these strikes we must face the real issues. Do we want to control and curb the strikes, or do we just want to fool the people of America into thinking we are doing something when we are not?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I would like to finish my statement; then I will be glad to yield.

I, for one, have come to feel that this is the time for us to take a stand. If there was ever a time in the history of our Nation when Members of Congress must stand up in the well of this House and speak their piece or answer the roll call "Yes" or "No" that time is now; and the question is: Do we want to correct the evil or do we want to continue to play cheap politics? I, for one, am sick and tired of it. Here we go on day in and day out drafting legislation, putting provisions in bills to do a job and then as soon as we start getting telegrams and letters from a handful of people back home we get scared to death. I would hate to be in a free-for-all scrap and have some of you guys there to help me out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This is not accurate, but it will illustrate what I mean. When you were running around still on the bottle with your associated farmers in California I prepared an amendment in 1939 to cover this very thing.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Do not talk about when I was running around with a bottle. I was no bottle baby in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] told you the facts a while ago. I am sincere in this proposition. Right now the AFL and the CIO in my State are sabotaging the agricultural program, even to the extent of depriving our people of certain necessary foods. We talk here about taking care of our allies. We have two organizations, labor organizations, if you please, and one or the other is picketing the other all the time, keeping food from being processed today in the State of California.

Let us not remove the effective parts of this bill that will do the job. I will go along with the Members in any way that is right, but I am not going to vote for a toothless piece of legislation. If we cannot put teeth in it, let us not have any law at all.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. In answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan, I am curious to know if what he favored

in 1939 was good legislation why it is not now?

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I answer the gentleman?

Mr. ELLIOTT. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will look at the RECORD of last Friday, instead of devoting all of his time to the Military Affairs Committee, and he is doing a good work there, he will see that bill was offered.

Mr. MAY. If it was good then why is it not good now?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is good now, but I cannot get anybody to listen to it.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I hope we may proceed to give this matter careful consideration before we sabotage the bill. Let us be fair about this matter. The only way to legislate is to legislate in the right direction. This is not in the right direction and if we want to control the evils which now exist, we are going to have to put teeth in the law and make it work. If you do not want it to work just add some of these milk-bottle babies to it and you will not have any bill at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the next to the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if some of the Members of this House who come from city districts have ever had the rather doubtful pleasure of spending the better part of a year raising food crops as we raised them in the western part of the United States, and taking those crops, which provide food for the people of the United States to the extent of one-third of all the perishable foods of the United States at certain seasons, and attempting to get them to market, or to a processing plant, as the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] mentioned the canneries, then having a jurisdictional fight between two labor unions, in which the farmer is not interested at all, result in the complete destruction of the food, the food that you have raised, and the complete loss of what amounts to a year's income. If you had had that pleasure, or had lived in an area where that had taken place, you would have no doubt whatever what to do with an amendment such as has been offered.

I would like to make a suggestion, if I may. This is not a section of the bill that should be stricken out. It may be a section of the bill in which, as one Member of the House suggested to me, there might be some changes in the wording to clarify it. It seems to me this is a section of the bill that should be left in, taken to the Senate, and then in conference, leave in the intent of the section but improve, if you will, the language.

I hope this House, not for our sake in the West but for the sake of the food that you people in the East and in the cities want from the West, will vote down this amendment and leave this section in the bill.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LANDIS. The gentleman realizes that these jurisdictional disputes are a breach of contract. You have the same penalty under section 10 which takes care of all breaches of contract.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not so understand it. I also realize that there are many technicalities which provide loopholes through which conflicts can slip if they are not carefully covered in the bill.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Is not a boycott usually caused by an organization that does not have a contract but wants to get a contract?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my colleague from California who lives in a district that knows exactly what this means.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I might add that the gentleman also lives in a district where the results of certain boycotts have been extremely disastrous to consumers, particularly in the Los Angeles area. I would like to call attention to the effect of one secondary boycott down there, where hay, hauled to a farmers' market by a trucker who was not employed by a union was declared hot. Then the unions went so far as to declare that the milk from the cow that ate that hay, was hot, and refused to haul it. Section 13 of the pending bill would put a stop to that sort of thing.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In the gentleman's own district a carload of food which was being shipped to a processing plant was stopped, although it left the farm before the jurisdictional dispute arose.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are assembled here today trying to pass legislation to curb strikes. Just 9 years ago this summer a steel strike took place in the United States. Let us look at the record of that strike. One week before it took place there met in New York City the biggest band of pirates of our time, known as the Steel Institute. They agreed around the table in that room not to recognize the CIO. You will remember that the press of that day said that Charlie Schwab sneaked out of the back door and agreed to put Bethlehem Steel and Lackawanna Steel on a 40-hours-a-week basis to get the Government contracts of four or five hundred million dollars, to comply with the Walsh-Healey Act. Remember that on Tuesday Ben Fairless, president of United States Steel, said that as long as he was president he would never recognize the CIO. Remember on a Friday of that week Myron Taylor tossed Ben Fairless and the rest of them out of the window and said he would recognize the CIO. You remember that strike that took place. Big Steel worked and Little Steel was on strike. Now what have we got? There met in the White House here a couple of weeks ago, Ben Fairless and Phil Murray. They came within a cent and a half of settling their dispute. But Fairless said

he had to go back to New York to get permission. Permission from whom? From Olds, chairman of the board of United States Steel. Now who was Olds? Olds was the man who said in 1940 when the President sent for him, having been asked whether they had to expand in steel, said, "No, sir; we can produce all the steel that the Allies and this country need if we go to war." Not only did Olds miss the boat, but he was the first man I ever heard of missing the ocean, because the United States Government expanded to the extent of \$919,000,000 in steel, besides private industry. Here was the same Olds who said we did not have to expand, but he came to Washington last week and wanted to raise steel \$13 a ton. Who do you think is to blame, labor or those fellows in the upper brackets? Labor came right down and accepted the President's proposal. But I again repeat, Fairless had to go back to New York to get his orders; the same man, the chairman of the board of directors of United States Steel, who knew so little about his own business as to say that no expansion in steel was necessary. He is the same man who is responsible for this strike today by telling them that they need \$13 a ton more on steel. That is the trouble. It is not with labor. It is with those fellows in New York. Not that I am defending Kaiser or his knowledge of steel, but he was correct when he said that Ben Fairless knew that a cent and a half difference in the wage was not enough. It was not low enough to destroy America but he had to go back, I repeat, to New York and take orders from a man who did not know that expansion in steel was necessary.

Suppose this Nation or the President had listened to what Olds said, that we did not need to expand, would we be assembled today in his Hall? When they had priorities on bobby pins, that is how much we needed steel during the war. And here is a man who said it was not necessary to expand, the same man that is tying up the country today and is trying to ease that blame onto labor. So there is the blame.

You look at the last time, when they went out on strike and lost. The Congress of the United States granted them 10 times more than what they went out on strike for in 1937. They gave them the right of collective bargaining, the right to organize, the right to picket. That was granted by this Congress. And here we are again today, trying to do something to promote strikes, not to prevent them.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at every stage in the discussion of every bill there is what you might term "an atomic era." The Landis amendment to the Case amendment is the atomic amendment to the Case bill. It would blow up and destroy every right that the public of America is entitled to from this bill. I cannot see why some of my colleagues are so fearful of offending organized labor. It has been my experience that once you go against or for any act contrary to the wishes of organized labor, they smear you in their CIO, A. F.

of L., and other publications, as having sinned against the Holy Ghost. As for me, I accept the mark of Cain that they have or may hereafter place on me. I want to be correctly identified where there will be no doubt as to my identity, because I know when I speak I represent 100,000,000 people who pay the major expense of government and who are not recognized as yet, but will be soon. There is some conjecture as to when the time will come. In my own mind, the adoption of the Landis amendment would destroy the very heart of this Case bill. The labor groups stay up day and night working out plans and strategy to confuse Members of Congress. Now is the time to call a halt. We know the labor organizations have shaken down the rank and file of many thousands of workers who were not in sympathy with such wrongdoings, but they had to pay tribute or they did not work, a mode of strategy which to this good hour has worked most perfectly. There is only one way to meet the issue, and that is with more votes than they have. Let us not be taken on a snipe hunt and kill this bill with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana. I do not know what his background is on labor matters, but we know today that strikes are going on throughout our Nation.

The city of New York is just about ready to call the Army to take over the tugboats, and the tugboat workers according to the press, have refused to agree. They called such acts civil war back in 1861, but we cannot rebel against our property being taken away from us. That is just peaceful picketing and the right to strike according to organized labor. To deprive the babies and mothers and other citizens of that great city of New York of food and fuel and the very necessities of life, is that justice? We all know, and there is no argument against it, organized labor is a privileged group in America, stronger than the law or any political organization that has ever been in power in this country, a supergovernment within this great Government that we love so well.

I have certainly been surprised at some of my colleagues whom I have followed on most occasions, particularly my good friend from Michigan. I thought that if ever there was a man whose heart had been purified with the dripping blood of the sins of labor, he was one of them. I have come to the conclusion that his heart has mellowed and that he, too, feels the quivering pulse of possibly the organization that has taken place over the week end.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. I want to stand as one representative of and for the 100,000,000 people of America who are paying the bill by taxes and furthermore paying the fiddler while Rome burns, while industry and labor squabble. Our taxes are mounting. Our privileges of citizenship are being taken away from us. Whenever they appoint somebody in some of our Government organizations to deal for one of my group, the majority group, that somebody is some laborite or from some other special group.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. My time is limited. If the gentleman can get me five more minutes, I will be happy to yield to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know, but you felt so sorry for me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, if the gentleman will let me correct him.

Mr. STEWART. I do not know whether I want to be corrected or not.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman said he would yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the interest of truth, you know, I think you ought to be corrected.

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the gentleman if he will withdraw his objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot do it before, but I will later, if you can rely that long on my word.

Mr. STEWART. I will take it for that long.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, you seemed to feel very bad because you fancied I had slipped from grace. I want to assure the gentleman that if he had taken the trouble to read the RECORD of last Friday, only last Friday, where I inserted proposed amendments to the Wagner Labor Act, he would have discovered just how wrong he is. You are another of those "Johnnie-come-lately's" who does not know and who would not advise himself as to how some of us stand. The amendment I proposed, the one that is on the Clerk's desk up there, will take care of this situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I renew my request that the gentleman's time be extended for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I will resume from the point at which I had arrived before the gentleman from Michigan made his statement. I hardly know how to interpret a man who has taken the position he has taken heretofore on labor matters. I cannot analyze his previous position with his position upon this matter at hand. It is just a little difficult for me to digest. Possibly, when I have been here as long as he has and have seen as many labor bills considered by this body, I will perhaps be in as good a position as he is to know where the right and the wrong in the administration of labor laws is. But I do want to say that America is at the crossroads. America is threatened. Jurisdictional strikes which this amendment, in my opinion, would condone, is one of the evils of the existence of the common American citizen. Strikes have become a burden upon our Government. When we vote an appropriation here, the tax-

payer pays the bill for all strikes. It takes away our tax money from the rest of us who are willing to go along and be good American citizens, worthy of the blood that our fathers lost upon the fields of battle when America first began to grow as a nation.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I should simply like to say that this bill either holds or goes to pieces in the waters in which it is now traveling. The adoption of this amendment would destroy the entire effort to get fair and adequate legislation to deal with the problem that threatens the security and the safety of the country.

Mr. STEWART. I thank the able gentleman, and I do think he is an able gentleman, for his valuable contribution, because I think he hit the bull on the nose when he made his statement. I want to talk to all of you about taking action. This matter of playing the role of tweedledee and tweedledum, hoping that you will blindfold labor when they are all around, even taking the remarks you strike out when you get permission to revise and extend, is going to be a little too much to attempt to straddle.

As I said in the outset, once you sin you are always a sinner. Now is the time to redeem yourself with the people of America. The people speak. I mean, they are riled up to the point where they are going to take action. Outside of a few little industrial districts, represented by perhaps 50 Congressmen, I believe the majority of the people of America want these strikes stopped. They want this group that tells you and me when we shall go to bed and when we shall get up, what we shall pay for socks, rent, and what we shall pay for biscuits, to give us a chance to live. The farmers of America are fed up with their crops being destroyed after they have been placed in transportation, through jurisdictional disputes or because they were harvested by themselves or unorganized labor. It is time for us to stand up like men, men like the small group of patriots that gave us this grand form of Government in 1776, and say to the people, "We are going to hand it back to you like George Washington wrested it from England. We are going to have that Government we have loved so long." This is no time for tweedledee and tweedledum. We do or we do not. Now, are you? It is up to you. I appeal to you. At this very minute the American people are appealing to you to take a positive position against unlawful strikes.

My seat in this Congress is not worth enough to me as an individual to make me violate the principles of my Government. It is a known fact that labor has more to do with the functions of this Government than the Democratic Party has or the Republican Party ever had to do with it when it was in power. A person who does not know that knows but little about the way our Government is run today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, during the reading of the bill for amendment yesterday, I did not take occasion to make any formal remarks, but simply stated some observations on pending amendments and asked questions which I felt would develop the viewpoint which Members would want to have very clear. It is now an appropriate time for me to speak again.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART], who has just finished speaking, said, "We either do or we do not." He declared, "It is either tweedledee or tweedledum." The gentleman indicates that there is a wavering within this House as to just exactly where, individually and collectively, the Members stand as we go into the second day of the reading of the Case bill, which has been made in order as a substitute to H. R. 4908.

The gentleman from Oklahoma also stated that in this country, in an earlier period, we had a civil war. I often recall a story of a dweller in my section. We were so-called border territory. At the beginning of the War Between the States he found himself torn between two interests. He did not know on which side to place his fortunes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I did not intend to say I was torn between two parts.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have not accused the gentleman of that. He has told us where he stands. Courage is an admirable trait.

Mr. STEWART. My people wore the gray. They went clear down from '61 to '65, while the State of West Virginia seceded.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, West Virginia is a political entity, as well as Virginia, and we paid our debt to Virginia, and we paid it with interest, I will say. But that does not mean there is not the most friendly feeling between West Virginia and Virginia. Our two States include a beautiful and productive section of America. At least two governors who have served as the Chief Executive of the Commonwealth of Virginia were born in West Virginia after West Virginia became a State.

Now, to go back to the story: This man was torn between his feelings for the North and the South. Finally he determined that he would purchase for himself a blue coat and a gray pair of trousers. The result was that the soldiers of the South shot him through the coat and the soldiers of the North shot him through the pants. If Members attempt, as the gentleman from Oklahoma indicates, to serve two masters they will not gain favor with either side and will be literally riddled by the voters of their congressional districts.

Now, a further observation: When I addressed my colleagues at the very outset of the general debate I stated that I was strongly in favor of H. R.

4908 as it was introduced, embodying within its provisions the request of the President of the United States. He desired not to deal with the overall subject of labor legislation, important as that might be for the consideration of the Congress on a later date, but he was determined if this instrumentality was placed within his jurisdiction to bring through this period of reconversion the production of essential consumer goods which the public was ready to purchase.

What did he do? He was courageous. I am not speaking of our national leader as a Democrat or a Republican. In the message to Congress, December 3, 1945, he challenged us with this language:

All who think seriously about the problem of reconversion—of changing our economy from war to peace—realize that the transition is a difficult and dangerous task.

I hope that the Congress will approve the steps which I am now taking. They are being taken in the interest of accelerating our production, promoting our reconversion program, and pushing forward to a higher standard of living.

This is an immediate program which is fair to both sides. I hope that the Congress, naturally disappointed at the failure of labor and management to agree upon a solution for the prevention of industrial disputes, will not adopt repressive or coercive measures against either side. A free American labor and a free American private enterprise are essential to our free democratic system. Legislation which would stifle full freedom of collective bargaining on either side would be a backward step which the American people would not tolerate.

What did he request? What was he against?

He covered the reconversion period, and that is the time element with which I am concerned. We must not act in haste and regret later what we have done, and he warned against repressive action in Congress. The President said he favored full freedom of collective bargaining. I do also. Fact finding would implement—not destroy—that full freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The President was dealing essentially with the reconversion problem. In my opinion, that is what I believe the committee should be considering today, these immediate problems of reconversion from war to peace. In the very nature of events we have a certain chaotic condition and economic unrest in this country. It was so after World War I and it is so, only more acute, after World War II because of the heavy lines of the picture and the number of industrial forces involved; yet we find ourselves today trying to write legislation hurriedly off the cuff, and attempting to write a bill covering the many problems of labor which should be dealt with just as the many problems of management should be studied. I had hoped

we would resolve the question by either the approval or the disapproval of the request of the President of the United States, and not try to embrace too many subjects.

I am just as vigorous in my opposition, as I stated last Thursday, against the top-heavy Case bill and its provisions as I am vigorous in the advocacy of the request in H. R. 4908 of the President of the United States.

I have felt, Mr. Chairman, the sting of the very strong and effective opposition of certain labor leaders. I may have it again and again. I would, however, remind my colleagues that approximately one-half of the workers in private industry in the United States have some type of union agreement with management. That means, as of 1944, about 14,500,000 workers in this country were working under union agreements. It means, certainly they were union workers in the bargaining which they collectively were making with management. About 65 percent of all the workers in the manufacturing industries of America have union agreements. We know that in a few industries, like coal mining and in the operation of railroads, the workers are almost 100 percent covered by agreements between management and labor. I am in favor of responsible unionism.

So, Mr. Chairman, in very factual and good spirit, I reiterate that I think we make a mistake in trying to legislate in connection with this over-all picture rather than to deal with it as the President requested on December 3. My colleagues, this is a period of reconversion, and we know this power of fact finding, with helpful aids, would be used only in the most extreme cases where the public interest is deeply involved. Labor and management should come together in the center of the so-called industrial ring to receive instructions from the referee, which is the American public. The public, with all this slugging to the finish between management and labor, is not only in the middle but being struck below the belt.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has again expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana for the simple reason that section 13 should remain in this bill if we hope to accomplish some of the objectives that various Members of this House have in mind. All we will do is to weaken this bill through the adoption of such an amendment.

In connection with this great question of management-labor disputes which we are debating today, let me say I am glad that at last it is here on the House floor so we can stand up and be counted as to what we are going to do. If this whole problem were not so serious, an individual would have to stop and laugh at the statements made here regarding who is prolabor and who is proindustry. I think the rank and file in this House are big enough to stand on their own

feet and be fair about this matter, and that is what I hope we are going to do today.

Those of us who happen to come from rural areas are often referred to by the boys in the city as our country cousins; I refer to them as city slickers. I sometimes believe these city slickers are not thinking through what is happening to their country today. I make this statement because of something that is now moving on through the agricultural sections of this great country of ours. It was emphasized awhile ago when a Member referred to the many difficulties the farmers are now up against in raising their crops, processing them, and bringing them to market. I hope the time never comes when we will have an agricultural strike in this country, but I do want you to know that some farm people of this Nation do have a cause, and someday they might well become a little more vociferous, talk louder, and do something about it.

This morning, a letter came to my desk which was not circulated in my district but in a district next to mine, and I want to read excerpts from it to emphasize what some of the agricultural people of this country are thinking about and why they want these difficulties between management and labor straightened out and straightened out right now. These farmers are not pro-labor or pro-industry but they are pro-American. If we do not now accept our responsibility and try to do something about labor-industry differences then we are not the right kind of Members of Congress. This letter says:

It's time for a show-down. There is nothing that will collapse as quickly as the human stomach.

Remember the Secretary of Agriculture just this week suggested that farmers should start sending hogs to market at lighter weights, because there is not enough corn on hand to feed them. Someone said over the radio the other night that there will be no white bread baked within a few months.

All right. Do not think for a minute that some of us cannot get just a little bit hungry in this country. What is happening? The farmer who has worked 12, 14, and 16 hours a day during this war to try to do his part toward food production, has depleted his land; he has worn out his machinery, and now he cannot get replacements or obtain help. He tries to buy new machinery, and he turns to the greatest implement-producing factory in the world, but what does he find? They are on strike. It is almost impossible to buy a piece of machinery in the United States. Go and try it. The other day a farmer in my district, who was in great need of a four-row corn planter, which formerly sold in the neighborhood of \$200 or \$250, when new, went to a sale and there he paid \$600 to get a used corn planter which he had to have to put his crop in the ground. Now, who is going to pay that unneeded additional expenditure of \$400 that it cost this farmer to buy that planter, because the factory cannot produce while they are on strike?

The letter continues, and I repeat I do not endorse all contents of the letter:

Politics is not the farmer's long suit. He ordinarily sits back and watches. But in self-defense, he must now prepare to take an active hand in the goings-on at Washington or take the distasteful consequences.

Disputes should be settled while men work. All the consuming public knows this, but union bosses have them bluffed.

I want to say to the House today that this whole matter goes much further than what the average rank and file of farmers may say about either wages or prices. It goes right down at the root of the problem: production in the United States of America. I repeat, I hope the time will never come when there is a strike in the agricultural sections of the country. But they have been again and again tested to the limit, and unless we remedy the situation now confronting us, we will be faced with more trouble than we have ever been before. I hope that we do not cut essential and vital parts out of this bill. I hope that we will proceed the way we have been going, and that we here and now make honest effort to do something to bring about a solution of the problems of labor and management and get production in high gear.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Suppose all the farmers that produce wheat or all the farmers that produce corn got together and decided they would not sell a bushel for the next 12 months to come, what would happen?

Mr. ARENDS. They would have to do that for not more than 30 days and we would have chaos, and some are thinking about it now. I am sorry to make that statement and I sincerely hope such a movement by the farmers is never started.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. These strikes in implement factories have so slowed down work so that really what we have today is an involuntary slow-down on the farms.

Mr. ARENDS. That is correct. And I am sorry to say it is my belief that the people of the cities do not realize what is taking place in this country. So I repeat, let us do everything possible now to pass constructive legislation that will help correct present-day conditions where we have so many unnecessary stoppages of work and when what we truly need, is for everyone to be working with all their productive effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, as I stated yesterday, we do want the most helpful debate on each and every amendment. I am wondering now what gentlemen want to speak directly to the Landis amendment, and if we could agree on some time, and then vote on that proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as far as I am concerned, I would not want 5 minutes. I wonder if we might not agree on taking less than 5 minutes apiece?

Mr. RANDOLPH. If any gentleman would want less than 5 minutes, that would be agreeable to me.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think this is about one of the most vital amendments that we are going to have on this bill. I think every Member of the House wants to understand what this is about and have ample debate before he votes on it. When this amendment is voted on we will have determined whether this House is going to do something or nothing. I hope the gentleman from West Virginia will withdraw his request for the present. I do not think it will run very long, but give these gentlemen 5 minutes apiece.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, I have no desire to hasten decisions on this amendment or any other. However, in view of what the gentleman from Virginia has said, I will withdraw my request and we will let the matter run along.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let us try to speed along on this amendment and make our remarks directly to the point.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, there is not too much I can contribute to the discussion of this amendment except I have tried as best I could to keep in touch with the situation in agriculture across the Nation. I do want you to realize in your consideration of this amendment that there is a growing restlessness throughout this country in the farming sections. That exists in Indiana, it exists in Ohio, and it exists in Missouri. As the gentleman from Illinois has mentioned, there has for the first time in this Nation been offered a proposal that those who till the soil, those who produce the food and the fiber to feed and to clothe the Nation, resort to their inalienable right to stop work.

Some of the things that have brought it on have been referred to here. There is a great strike now in one of the farm machinery manufacturers' plants. Do you know what they are striking for? You probably have not noticed it because it has been overshadowed by the steel and General Motors strikes. They are striking for a 6-hour day, 30 hours a week.

Have you stopped to consider for a minute how much food you would have if the farmers of this Nation worked 6 hours a day, 30 hours a week? Have you ever produced your crops, carried them to town, and been unable to unload them because two unions were engaged in a jurisdictional strike and nobody could enter the place?

I think at this hour, according to the newspaper accounts, the Cabinet is meeting at the White House with the Presi-

dent of the United States. They are trying to find ways to feed the starving people of Europe. You know who must produce the food; the same ones who produced it for the four long years of the war without adequate farm machinery, without adequate help—the farmers of this Nation.

The only reason I am talking to you now is that already there is a movement among farmers out West, and it should not be necessary. Do not, as the representatives of the people of this Nation, and particularly of those who till the soil, let the word go out this afternoon that the Congress has stricken from this bill a provision that would help them in marketing their commodities after they have worked in the sun for months to produce them. That is the danger we are facing when we send out word to the farmers of this Nation that there has been stricken from the bill a paragraph which has only one single purpose, to stop the practices now going on in jurisdictional strikes. If you think the farmer's wagon should be stopped and he not be permitted to market his produce until he joins a union, then vote for this amendment. That is the issue.

There is a terrible feeling of restlessness going on among the farmers. I am afraid of it, to be frank with you. I do not want to see the farmers of this Nation go on strike. I have talked to them, I have worked with them throughout the years as they have watched the practices going on in other parts of this Nation, and I am frightened by this amendment, which, if adopted, would leave those who feed the Nation utterly helpless.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS] to strike out section 13. The best that can be said of the gentleman's argument is that it is exceedingly weak. It cannot hurt to repeat and thus emphasize the need for curbing jurisdictional strikes and boycotts. It is contended that the provisions of sections 10 and 11, either or both of them, cover the situation. The best argument against that contention is the reading of section 13. It covers a state of facts not contemplated and not mentioned, and provides a remedy that is not stipulated in the preceding sections 10 and 11.

Widespread and increasing strife and strikes result in the loss of millions of dollars of production and of millions of dollars of purchasing power every day. It has been correctly and repeatedly asserted that labor organizations oppose the pending bill or any legislation. It might, with equal force, be said that management opposes the pending bill. But the long-suffering public, the innocent bystander, demands constructive legislation curbing labor and providing for the cooperation of management. In the contest between wages and prices the public interest is suffering and demands legislation, notwithstanding the opposition of both labor and management.

It has been said that the Case bill has not received committee consideration. An unprecedented condition confronts the House. No member of the committee

supports the reported bill. The substitute has been the subject of debate and consideration for more than 4 days. It is being considered by the House in the Committee of the Whole. The principles have been repeatedly brought to the attention of the House. There is no occasion for extended consideration of the fundamental abuses at which the bill is aimed.

In the nineties and again following the twenties the Government intervened to restrain the selfish and irresponsible exercise of vast power by capital and management. The Utility Act and the Securities and Exchange Act were passed. Capital rode to a fall. Today the exercising of unprecedented power by labor organizations threatens to destroy a helpless public. Labor now is riding to a fall. Unless the Government intervenes the welfare of many will be sacrificed to the interests of the few. While I favor collective bargaining the public must be protected. The effect of strikes upon the great mass of the public is paramount.

The strike is a weapon, but it can be a dangerous weapon, and when dangerous its use should be restricted. Strikes have now reached the point where there is not only serious injury to the public economy, but the public is being deprived and sacrificed. It is time for the Congress to assume and to exercise our responsibilities as the representatives of the many rather than as the spokesmen of the few. It is time for action.

The country demands that economic chaos cease and that order and production, including the production of farm machinery, be restored. It is not a matter of party, but it is a question of country and a question of whether the public interest will be promoted.

As I have indicated, there is no occasion for protracted debate or extended consideration. The public demands that both labor and management live up to their contracts. There is nothing extreme or new in this provision of the Case bill. Only extreme partisans would contend that there is anything unfair about that provision of the bill.

First. The declaration of the Case bill is sound. Collective bargaining is declared to be the cornerstone of enterprise. Government decisions should not be substituted for free agreement, but free agreement should be promoted and obtained. Contracts should be binding upon both management and labor. Conciliation, mediation, and arbitration will be provided.

Second. The bill provides for a labor-management board with powers of conciliation and mediation. Arbitration is promoted.

Third. Both labor and management are required to live up to their contracts. No further consideration is necessary.

Fourth. Strikes and lock-outs in the public interest are prohibited until there is a period of fact finding, and strikes in public utilities essential to the maintenance of health and safety are limited. The bill is clear on this point. No further consideration on this score is required.

Fifth. Lock-outs and strikes are prohibited for a reasonable fact-finding period. The status quo is maintained

while bargaining is given a chance. The Norris-LaGuardia Act is amended so as to make effective orders for maintaining the status quo, and this is only a partial amendment of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It should be said, once and for all, that the act is not repealed. The Case bill provides that the Norris-LaGuardia Act shall not prevent the maintenance of the status quo pending fact finding to protect the public interest.

Sixth. Violence in support of strikes is curbed. Mass picketing is prevented. There is no rational ground for their defense. Injunctions may be used under the section, and there is thus a sound modification of the LaGuardia Act as well as a modification of the Wagner or the National Labor Relations Act. I may say that other amendments to the Wagner Act should be made. I have voted for, and supported, such amendments in legislation that passed the House in 1940, and it died in the Senate. It is one-sided. Employers are right in demanding equality under the Wagner Act. But any existing act that protects violence and mass picketing without further debate or consideration should be changed.

Seventh. Boycotts, jurisdictional, and secondary strikes should be prohibited and the Norris-LaGuardia or any other act should be modified so as to prevent boycotts. There is thus a third modification of the Norris-LaGuardia Act to ban boycotts, jurisdictional, and secondary strikes.

I have thus briefly outlined the essential provisions of the Case bill. It contains not only prohibitions, but affirmative provisions. Strikes would be prohibited for 35 days for an opportunity for mediation and arbitration. Both the affirmative and the prohibitory provisions of the Case bill have been generally considered not only by the public, but by Members of Congress. There has been ample time for debate and discussion in the Committee of the Whole, probably the best of all committees, for 4 days. Perfecting amendments have been adopted. While not a complete or perfect remedy, the Case bill is the only vehicle or the only bill under the rules of the House that gives Members an opportunity to vote to curb in the public interest the wholly indefensible strikes and strife, increasing day by day, that are destructive to the public interest and are fast destroying our economic order.

While I do not agree with President Truman's recommendations for compulsory investigation of employers, although I agree with a cooling-off 30-day period, he was certainly right in urging that Congress, if they did not approve his recommendations, adopt its own constructive program. Of all the bills suggested and of all the measures introduced, I believe that the Case bill is not only fair to both labor and management, but in the general public interest. I only wish that the Case bill, under the rules of the House, could be further amended to amend the Wagner Act, and to provide other restraints on organized labor.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, in the city of New York the great Idlewild Airport has been under construction for many months. Two labor difficulties on that job delayed the construction and increased the cost. In the first instance, there was a jurisdictional dispute between two unions which delayed the project, as I recall, 2 or 4 months. In the second, the electricians' union refused to install certain electrical devices which had been brought from some other State unless union members were permitted to disassemble those devices and reassemble them on the job.

I wish to ask the gentleman from Indiana how the bill covers those contingencies in the event his amendment is adopted.

Mr. LANDIS. If a contract is made and either party breaks the contract, section 10 covers every contract that is made between management and labor.

Mr. BUCK. What about this matter of disassembling electrical equipment and reassembling it?

Mr. LANDIS. Is it covered by a contract?

Mr. BUCK. I think it is evident, Mr. Chairman, that if this amendment carries we will not have a solution to the two conditions that have delayed that airport and increased its construction cost.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. MAY. Inasmuch as we have a bill here reported by the Committee on Labor that no member of the committee is for, have we not the right to assume that it is improper legislation? And if that be true, what have we got to vote for except the Case substitute?

Mr. BUCK. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. I am in sympathy with the objective sought by section 13, but it occurs to me as a lawyer that if that provision were on the statute books and I undertook to draft a bill seeking relief under it with respect to a boycott or a sympathetic strike I just could not conceive of how I would frame the prayer of the bill, how I would formulate the fiat of a judge for an injunction that would afford any relief. Remember, we cannot make people work.

We can declare sympathetic strikes and boycotts illegal and deprive participants in such illegal acts of the rights under the Wagner bill. And I believe if this provision with respect to the use of the injunction were cut out and the provision retained with respect to the loss of their rights there would be a valid enactment; but I just cannot conceive how one would enforce that provision of an injunction.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I believe the gentleman from Tennessee has made an excellent suggestion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will take care of the suggestion of the gentleman from Tennessee by an amendment which will

be offered as soon as the vote is taken on this one.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

By unanimous consent the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the first thing I want to do is to correct an error that the alter ego of the CIO in this House keeps stating—for political purposes, as I see it, for there could be no other reason for an intelligent person to make such erroneous statements—to the effect that we who are trying to get something done for our country in this time of need are enemies to labor. The fact is, we are trying to help labor by keeping them from doing that which they seem determined to do, whereby they are losing all the respect and assistance of the honest people of our land. When I say we are trying to help labor, I mean honest laboring men and not racketeers.

Surely, surely honest people who belong to labor organizations can see the handwriting on the wall, and know that America is not going to put up with what is now and has been going on for some time in the way of strikes and stoppages of production, to the detriment of the country, the people, and themselves. Reconversion is being hampered—production so badly needed is being stifled without any just cause or reason. And when we try to do something with the situation in behalf of the people of this country, this bunch begins to cry "Wolf! Wolf!" until the people are sick and tired of it. This happens every time a remedial measure in behalf of the public is brought before this House. Let me tell you something: The people are aroused as never before, and if this Congress does not correct the chaotic condition now existing, a number of us might as well begin packing our belongings, for we are not going to stay here after this year. The people will see to that.

Down our way the people believe in being honest and carrying out the terms of their contracts. A gentleman will do so, and one that does not do so is not considered a gentleman. Yes; they believe in keeping their word, whether it be written or oral; they will carry out the terms of their agreements.

Let us see now what is being done in 99 out of every 100 strikes that are in progress at this time. Take the steel strike and see what was included in that contract, which has some time yet to run, yet the CIO called a strike in the face of their solemn promise not to do so during the life of that contract which they secured, which gave them an increase in wages, and which they do now break. The no-strike clause reads as follows:

During the term of this agreement, neither the union nor any employee, individually or collectively, shall cause or take part in any strike, or other interruption, or any impeding of production at any plant of the company covered by this agreement. Any employee or employees who violate the provisions of this section may be discharged from the employ of the company in accordance with the procedure of section 8 of this agreement.

And down in the State of Tennessee, at the home town of our colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the CIO is on strike against the Southern Ferro Alloys Co. In fact, the CIO has called strikes against six Chattanooga plants. The contract for the company named, which was entered into on October 24, 1945, was to continue until October 1, 1946, and contained the following clause:

The contracting parties agree that for the full period of this agreement, extension or renewal thereof, there shall be no strikes by the union or lock-outs by the company.

Notwithstanding this provision, the contract entered into, which settled the wages apparently to the satisfaction of the union, was breached that same afternoon when a letter postmarked 3:30 o'clock was mailed to the company demanding a reopening of wages and an increase of \$2 per day. According to the contract, this could not be discussed for 15 days, but in only 5 days after the contract was signed the union notified the National Labor Relations Board that a controversy existed with the company, and demanded a strike vote. No conference was held, no bargaining attempted. Later there was a conference, at which there was a demand of the union to "take it or leave it", and no attempt was made to bargain in good faith.

A like provision was contained in the contract entered into with General Motors, in which the CIO agreed not to strike during the life of the contract, and yet they violated that provision and struck approximately 6 months before the contract was to expire. This is true, as I have stated, in 99 cases out of 100; and it is up to the Congress to pass a law that will guarantee equal rights to both sides and special privilege to neither. That is the American way, and any industry or labor organization that objects to it has something wrong with their Americanism.

As I see it, at this time the Case bill is the best piece of legislation before us. It does not satisfy me and it will not satisfy the public, in that it does not go far enough. But it is a step in the right direction, and unless we get something better, it is my intention to support it. Until we have laws that make each side responsible for their acts, that recognize the interests of the public, and that are two-way streets instead of a dead-end, we will not get any relief from this crowd that holds their sacred and binding contracts only as scraps of paper. As has been said on this floor, a war was caused once because a contract was considered a scrap of paper.

Law-abiding citizens have always advocated the living up to contracts openly and freely made, and they should be carried out. Is it not peculiar to you that practically all of the alter egos of the CIO are afraid of the law and afraid of the courts. Down our way, the old philosopher taught us that those who were afraid of the law and the courts were the criminals and the representatives of the criminals. Down our way we believe in law and order. We believe in that rule of action commanding what is right and prohibiting what is wrong. To

deny any American citizen or citizens, whether it be individuals, associations, or corporations, the right to go in a court of justice for a redress of a wrong, and deny them the benefits of the law or equity of the land, is placing ourselves in a position of agreeing with the anarchists, and placing us on the side of anarchy.

Let us see what the Case bill does.

First. It seeks to strengthen and continue collective bargaining, by providing a 30-day period without loss of position to either side. How can anyone object to this provision? It is as much in behalf of labor as it is in behalf of industry. It gives them time to cool off and work on a sane, sensible basis with reference to collective bargaining. As I have understood the full import and meaning of collective bargaining, I have always been in favor of it. But as collective bargaining is operating today, unless it is supplanted with collective efficiency, collective square dealing, collective honesty, and collective love of our fellow-man, it will not and cannot be a success.

Second. The Case bill seeks to require mutual responsibility for carrying out the sacred terms of a contract signed and made. Can any American object to that?

Third. It eliminates all force and violence from use by either or both sides, in industrial disputes. Those who believe in this believe in organized communities going under law and order, while those who are opposed to such a provision place themselves on the side of anarchists and anarchy; and I feel that the intelligent membership of the Congress should support this provision.

To condemn the law is to condemn ourselves if the American Congress has made laws not in keeping with that ideal and definition, then it is a pretty heavy charge that we are laying against the lawmaking body of our land and against ourselves. I am not willing to do that, in order to please the whims of a class of people who consider their contracts as scraps of paper.

Let us pass the Case bill and not cripple it by amendments; improve on it if we can, but not water it down because it is mild enough as it is. Let us work in the interest of 130,000,000 citizens of our great country, and not discriminate against the bulk of them and work in the interest of class legislation for a small minority, who are in the main dominated and ruled by a racketeering class whose ideals are as far from the American ideals as the moon is from the earth.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, there can be no disagreement with the position that any lawless action or violence or abuse of power on the part of anybody is not only bad for the Nation

but bad for the group that commits it. The problem that confronts Congress, however, is to find an appropriate answer to these problems.

I should like to point out that considerable reference has been made in the debate that has just taken place to the State of California. May I say that California has on its statute books today a law which prohibits secondary boycotts. That was the so-called hot cargo bill. It is the law now in our State. With regard to the troubles taking place out there at the present time, it is due to a jurisdictional dispute.

What is the answer to the jurisdictional strikes? Are you going to pass a law saying there shall not be any jurisdictional strikes? That will make everybody feel just fine and virtuous, and perhaps some people will come back to Congress. But I am not a bit sure you can solve the problem by so oversimplified a means.

The thing that has to be done about a problem of this kind is that you have to find what a constructive remedy for it is. I have been trying very hard to find a constructive remedy. I think I know the line along which a constructive remedy for jurisdictional strikes has to be found. I think it has to be found in setting up some means of getting what amounts to a judicial decision of jurisdictional disputes. Legislation to accomplish that would have to be devised with some care. I think you have to set up some kind of an impartial group that can make decisions with regard to these jurisdictional strikes, so that instead of just forbidding tuberculosis, shall we say, which is about as reasonable as to say there shall not be jurisdictional disputes, you have an answer to the thing, a machinery for preventing the difficulty, and a means of avoiding it.

Therefore, in the instant case, where Congress is attempting to legislate about these matters, it has seemed to me that we have to recognize that our greatest need is to get real consideration of the problems involved here without reference either to a point of view which insists upon punitive measures or to a point of view which says, "we will not consider anything if there is opposition to it on the part of the great labor organizations." Neither of those points of view will work, and we have suffered from the absence of enough people and enough earnest effort to get at these problems constructively with both of those points of view eliminated.

In the bill before us we had better stick to things where we know what we are doing and what we can accomplish by what we attempt. It is for that reason that I think we should aim this legislation we have before us today at improvement of the collective-bargaining process, at machinery that has been tested by time and under other legislation, so that we will know what we are getting at and what we are going to accomplish as nearly as possible under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALLAGHER].

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ford has stated that labor and capi-

tal can get together, because it will pay, if you will quit price ceilings. I say that labor and capital will settle their strikes over the board in collective bargaining under the laws we have now, without strikes, if you do not promise them that this Congress or the President or someone will help them get better prices for their goods.

I wonder how many men in this House know anything about labor difficulties in the days before we had organized labor. I have worked for 14 or 15 cents an hour in the freight houses. We worked 10 hours a day. If our job was not done, they added another hour of two and they did not pay us anything. Unless a person had a relative or stood in with the people who ran the organization, regardless of the fact that he had children, he was pushed out of the picture, and someone else, maybe a man who worked for \$3 and \$4 a day during the summer took his place; and this other man who had worked all winter, the man with a family, was out of a job. There was favoritism of all kinds. Some of it was graft. I want to say that unless you had a pull you had no chance whatever.

Another thing, we in Minneapolis never objected to a fellow having the same right to a job as we did but you could start in the summer and get laid off because you were the first one there. When you came back, they would say, "We have nothing against you, but we do not need so many men now. But the first thing in the spring we will hire you." But when you got back there, you found out that the salesman had promised jobs and they had 15 to 20 men in that organization working. When you spoke to the boss for a job, you had to say, "Mister" with your hat in your hand. Thank God we have a chance to organize now. I do not believe any of these slave propositions is going to help the situation. There are many things that can be corrected, but that is a matter concerning our tax laws. If you allow business and labor to settle their own problems without congressional dictation, you will find there will be no strikes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk directly to the amendment. I shall make it as short and as brief as I can. It is impossible for us to leave the solution of all problems to labor and management. We will find that the public is overlooked. A case directly in point is contained in the story that appeared in the Evening Star last night about a secondary boycott in New York City.

The Associated Press reported from New York that a strike by 3,500 tugboat workers, supported by 35,000 longshoremen, had tied up shipping in the harbor, and was cutting off a large portion of the city's food and fuel supplies. It reported that Mayor O'Dwyer estimates that the city would be without 80 percent of its normal flow of coal and other fuel and nearly half of its food supply.

Joseph P. Ryan, president of the ILA, said that the 35,000 longshoremen of the

parent union would support the walkout by refusing to load or unload any ship which normally would be handled by the strikers.

I call your attention that this paragraph which is proposed to be stricken from the bill deals with secondary boycotts. This does not concern the members from farming districts alone. You have secondary boycotts threatening you in New York.

The gentleman from Virginia, I think it was, said a few minutes ago that the President was having a meeting in the White House right now to consider how they would get food for the world. He is likely to be having a meeting to find out how they will get food for the city of New York.

Now, that is one of the situations we seek to get at by the operation of this section 13, which deals with the refusal to handle, use, or otherwise deal with articles or materials purchased, and so forth.

My own personal interest may grow out of situations like those described by the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from California, who have talked about the delivery of produce by farmers to their markets. But certainly a boycott also affects the people in the cities.

The other thing that section 13 seeks to deal with is jurisdictional strikes. On that point I want to give the words of the President of the United States as to the need for legislation on that point. I quote what he said to the labor-management conference last fall. President Truman said:

Some substitutes must be found for jurisdictional strikes. Business simply cannot stop. Life and property just cannot be endangered merely because of some internal disagreement between factions of labor, in which management can rightfully have no part and no interest. There can be no moral or economic justification for stopping production while rival organizations contend with each other. Labor has a particular interest in this matter—for nothing is so destructive of public confidence in the motives of trade unionism as a jurisdictional strike.

Labor does have an interest in this matter. So do farmers; so do city dwellers. So I beg of you, do not take section 13 out of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LANDIS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 14, line 9 of the Case amendment, after the word "forth", and after the period and dash, insert "Whenever any act mentioned in this section shall obstruct or interfere with interstate or foreign commerce."

And strike out subsection (b), and insert the following:

"Whoever violates the provisions of this section—

"(1) shall on and after such violation cease to have, and cease to be entitled to, the status of an employee for the purposes of sections 7, 8, and 9 of the National Labor Relations Act, or the status of a representative for the purposes of such act;

"(2) in case such violation is by a labor organization, such organization shall thereof cease to have and cease to be entitled to a status of a representative or labor organization under the National Labor Relations Act, for a period of not less than 90 days, nor more than 6 months."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the hope that I may secure the support of the sponsor of this bill, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps it was my own fault that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART] misunderstood what I was trying to get across awhile ago. I was only attempting to show to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and some others, that some of us did have some other suggestions which we thought should be included in this legislation. I stated explicitly and, I thought, clearly enough that if the Landis amendment were out I would offer another amendment to section 13. I would like the attention of the gentleman sponsoring this bill, that we are now considering, to this amendment. The amendment I propose now does not weaken the language of section 13 in any way insofar as the language relating to violence is treated. To those gentlemen who suspect that I may have softened up toward Dan Tobin's teamsters' union, I need only say that 2 days after the Supreme Court handed down the decision legalizing extortion when practiced by the teamsters' union an amendment was offered by me to correct that defect in the law. Later the Hobbs bill went to the body at the other end of the Capitol and has been there ever since. It went over there more than 2 years ago. Now, I would like the sponsors of this bill to tell me how you expect to get this bill out of the other body. But that is not my worry, though it is a matter of concern.

Now to get back to this amendment. The amendment does not change the sense of the language down to and including line 22. Please read it and compare it with the words of the amendment. The amendment does strike from the bill section (b) which gives the courts jurisdiction to issue injunctions and take other action notwithstanding the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

I wish the gentleman from Oklahoma had been successful in convincing those who speak for so-called labor leaders, those on my right here, that I was speaking for them. I am afraid he was not. If they would only go along on that idea until this amendment is voted on, I, for one, would appreciate it.

Now, understand, the amendment does defeat the attempt to repeal the Norris-LaGuardia Act; and I ask for that not because I think that act insofar as its provisions about the issuance of injunctions should not be repealed, but I put it in there hoping that some of the real friends of labor would go along now with what we might call this half-way legislation to aid in the settlement of labor disputes and support it.

The other part of the amendment makes the union—which the act as written does not—liable for a violation of section (a), as now in H. R. 5262. The penalty imposed by the amendment is not a fine, not imprisonment; it just deprives the union of the special privileges which we have given it under the National Labor Relations Act. Certainly, when you give an organization special privileges, it should, in fairness, be willing to go along and keep its word, its contract, comply with what it has agreed to do, and refrain from assault and battery. The only penalty—I am repeating now—the only penalty contained in the amendment is to take away from those who have been granted special privileges the special privileges that have been given—take away those special favors until they repent and reform. There is nothing bad about that.

There is another point in the amendment. A similar amendment was adopted yesterday by adding this proposed provision to section 5. One more point—that is, to insert the words "whenever any act mentioned in this or a subsequent section shall obstruct or interfere with interstate and foreign commerce."

I would like to ask the sponsors of this bill if they cannot accept this amendment to this particular section? I see no reason why they cannot.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am seeking for information on this thing, and wish to ask the gentleman whether he believes that the exercise by a court of the power of injunction against a violator or violators of the provisions of this section would be effective to the extent of compelling the men to go back to work?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I do not. I think that if you have injunctions you will have as many different theories as to when an injunction should be issued as you have courts or judges.

Mr. WADSWORTH. For example, the gentleman from South Dakota stated the situation now existing in the harbor of New York where apparently, judging from newspaper dispatches, the longshoremen's union is going to embark upon a strike in support of the tugmen's union.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Secondary and a boycott.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Secondary and a boycott, yes. Would an injunction issued against the longshoremen's union be effective in making those 35,000 men go to work?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not in my opinion. I do not think so. The remedy is to take from those strikers the special privilege which we have given them. If they do not want to work, that is all right, let them strike—that is their right—but the city of New York and its people will need food, so let some one else work if those who strike are tired of their jobs. I would not try to make any man work if he does not want to. If he wants to depend on the charity of relatives or if some great-granddad left him some money, and if he can get along that way, all right, but, on

the other hand, I would not let that man deprive any other man of the opportunity of working.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I did not quite get the language of the gentleman's amendment. As I understand his explanation he leaves in subsection (a) and strikes out section (b)?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Does the gentleman substitute anything in lieu of section (b)? Does he put anything in place of (b) or leave it with (a)?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I tried to make clear that the object is to deprive the individual of certain rights given by the NLRA. I repeat, the penalty for a violation of this section is imposed upon the individual member of the union and upon the union if the union violates section (a).

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. It is the gentleman's purpose to make the loss of privileges under the National Labor Relations Act come into effect and the gentleman thinks that is much more effective than any court injunction could possibly be?

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Under the gentleman's amendment how does the farmer get his produce unloaded?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just the same as under section 13 of the bill. It makes it unlawful for these men to interfere with those hauling produce or merchandise to market. If they interfere then they lose their rights under the NLRA.

Mr. PACE. I again ask, How does that allow the farmer to unload his produce?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It does not attempt to make the truck driver unload the produce, but it does permit a farmer to send his hired man to market with his load of produce, or he may hire the gentleman from Georgia to take the load down, and if there is interference by force the union man and his union loses the special rights given by the National Labor Relations Act, and without which the union cannot exist.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. As a matter of fact, anyone who knows anything about the delivery of farm produce to the market by the farmer knows very well that the farmer unloads the produce or his hired man.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They do not in Detroit. The union decrees that you must hire a union man to drive the truck through the city and to unload it.

Mr. WOODRUFF. We do not have farmers up my way who can hire all this to be done because the farmers in my part of the country who deliver their

produce into Detroit and other centers of population unload their own trucks.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I hope that you gentlemen who favor some sort of effective legislation will support this amendment. Let me go over it again. It keeps all of subsection (a) of section 13 in the same words. On page 574 it strikes out subsection (b) which is the section giving the United States district courts authority to issue injunctions notwithstanding the Norris-LaGuardia Act. It makes the penalty the forfeiture of the special privileges and rights which the employees and which the unions have under the National Labor Relations Act, and it also contains that all-important and vital provision relating to obstruction of interstate and foreign commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BELL: Page 3, line 19, of the Case amendment, strike out beginning in line 19, page 3, to and including line 21, page 11, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"CERTIFICATION OF DISPUTES"

"SEC. 2. Whenever the Secretary of Labor finds—

"(1) that there is a labor dispute in which the agencies of the Government charged with the functions of mediation and conciliation have been unable to bring the parties to agreement and have been unable to induce the parties voluntarily to submit the controversy to arbitration; and

"(2) that a stoppage of work seriously affecting the national public interest and affecting interstate or foreign commerce, or the national defense, or commerce within the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States, has resulted or threatens to result from such dispute;

"the Secretary shall certify such findings to the President. Any such certification of the Secretary shall be published in the Federal Register and shall designate the employer or employers involved in such dispute, the groups or units of employees involved in such disputes, and the representative or representatives of such employees. The employers, employees, and representatives so designated shall, for the purposes of this act, be regarded as the parties to the dispute. Whenever a question arises concerning the representation of such employees, the Secretary of Labor may request the National Labor Relations Board to certify to him the names of the representatives of such employees; and such Board shall determine the names of such representatives in the manner provided in section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act and shall certify such names to the Secretary.

"FACT-FINDING BOARDS"

"SEC. 3. (a) At any time within 5 days after the date of such certification by the Secretary of Labor, the President, in his discretion, may appoint a board to investigate such labor dispute and to make a report containing its findings of fact and recommendations with respect to such dispute. Such board shall be composed of three or more persons, none of whom has any pecuniary or other private interests in the employers or employees who are parties to the dispute. The board shall proceed expeditiously to make a thorough investigation of all facts

which it deems relevant to the dispute. The board shall give the parties to the dispute a full and fair hearing, which shall include an opportunity to present evidence in support of their claims and an opportunity to present their case in person, by counsel, or by their representatives. Within 20 days after the date of its appointment, the board shall submit to the President a report containing its findings of fact and such recommendations concerning the dispute as the board deems appropriate. The time for submitting the report of the board may be extended by agreement of the parties, or their representatives, with the approval of the President. Any agreement extending such time shall be published in the Federal Register.

"(b) The several department and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the board, upon its request, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the board.

"(c) Any board appointed under this section may prescribe or adopt such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to govern its procedures and the exercise of its functions. Each of the members of such board shall receive compensation at such rate, not exceeding \$100 a day, as may be fixed by the President, and shall receive his necessary travel and other expenses incurred in connection with the work of the board. Such compensation and expenses shall be paid by the Secretary of Labor.

"(d) The Secretary of Labor shall provide for the board such stenographic, clerical, and other assistants and such facilities, services, and supplies as may be necessary to enable the board to perform its functions. When a board appointed under this section has made its report, the board shall be dissolved and its records shall be transferred to the Secretary of Labor.

"EXEMPTION"

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall be applicable with respect to any labor dispute subject to the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

"APPROPRIATIONS"

"SEC. 5. Such appropriations as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this act are hereby authorized."

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, this is proposed as an amendment to the so-called Case bill. The purpose of my amendment is to strike out that portion of the Case bill beginning at line 19 on page 3 of the Case bill, beginning with the heading "Labor-Management Mediation Board" and running over to and including line 21 on page 11. I am seeking to substitute for that language the following language which appears in the so-called Norton bill, H. R. 4908. You start on line 5 on the first page of the Norton bill and go right on through that bill until you get to line 14 on page 6.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will yield, is that the bill, H. R. 4908, as introduced or as reported by the committee?

Mr. BELL. As reported by the committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With the committee amendments?

Mr. BELL. That is right; at least, I assume it is with all committee amendments. It is H. R. 4908 as I find it printed.

Here is my purpose in seeking the adoption of this amendment. The Case bill sets up over a number of pages, down to the bottom of page 11, a permanent board, which I think will be a vast and growing addition to our bureaucracy. It provides that this board shall consist of six or more members. You can have as many as you want, but not less than six. It provides that at least two members are to represent labor, another two are to represent business, and a third two are to represent the public. The two representing the public will be a good deal like the man who interfered in the fight between the Irishman and his wife. In about the next minute he found the Irishman on one side and his wife on the other, each giving him some pretty good blows. I think that sort of a board would not be effective. I do not think it is the kind of board we want.

The bill provides for the setting up of a secretariat, for salaries, for clerk hire, and all of those things that go with the establishment of a permanent institution. In order to live, that board is going to have to have some strikes to settle. They have to have them or they will go out of business. I do not like that sort of set-up.

In the Norton bill a board of three or more members is provided for, not as a permanent board; it merely gives the President the right in the event a strike arises which affects the public interest or which interferes with interstate commerce, a stoppage of work which affects the national interest, to appoint three or more men for the purpose of helping to negotiate a settlement of that strike. When they have negotiated a settlement and their work is done, they are through. You do not have a continuing bureaucracy to hamper the work of those who want to go back to work. I do not understand the President in his message to ask for any permanent board. All he wants are two very simple things. I think this proposal of mine will not in anywise affect the thing that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is trying to do. I think it will even aid in what he is trying to do. On the other hand, I think we will have a situation where we will not saddle the country with another bureaucracy by the adoption of the amendment I have offered.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. Am I to understand that the gentleman starts with the Norton bill on page 3 and includes all the language that is used in the Norton bill?

Mr. BELL. It starts on page 1, line 5, where it says, "Certification of disputes" and takes all of the language of the Norton bill down to where it says, "Appropriations" two lines from the bottom. All there is in those provisions is the language providing for this board.

Mr. JENKINS. Do you take all of pages 3 and 4 and follow the language right through as it was in the old bill?

Mr. BELL. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. In other words, the gentleman takes the old bill, except what the committee took out of the bill in reporting it to the House?

Mr. BELL. That is right.

Mr. PLOESER. Does that mean you put back the same fact-finding provisions of the old bill?

Mr. BELL. I do not know what you call the old bill. This is the bill H. R. 4908 as printed.

Mr. PLOESER. I should not call it the old bill, but at the same time that is what it appears to be right now. I mean, the Norton bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. BELL. That is right. I follow exactly the language of the Norton bill from line 5 on page 1 down to the last paragraph providing for appropriations which I assume the Case bill takes care of in another form.

Mr. PLOESER. That provides for fact-findings and a reported recommendation to the President?

Mr. BELL. It is the printed form of the Norton bill providing for the setting up of a board for the payment of a per diem—so much a day—\$100, and for the fact-finding. That is all there is in that provision. It merely provides for the fact-finding board and fixing the per diem. Then, when they have done their work, they go home again.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. The amendment which the gentleman offers, as I understand it, is taken verbatim from the Norton bill.

Mr. BELL. That is right.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. The gentleman is aware of the fact that in the President's recommendation he asks for a 30-day cooling-off period.

Mr. BELL. That is right.

Mr. PLOESER. That will not be provided in the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BELL. No; that is true.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Nor does the amendment, as I understand it, which is offered by the gentleman, have any enforcing provisions in it at all, does it?

Mr. BELL. No; it does not have an enforcing provision. It is merely a provision to set up a temporary board for the purpose of fact-finding, recommendation, and helping the disputants to get together.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. But with no machinery to maintain the status quo or to provide, as the President said, for a cooling-off period.

Mr. BELL. No; it does not provide for anything of that kind. One of the reasons why I think this provision is better than that in the Case bill is that you have a lengthy provision setting up this board providing for certain injunctive relief, which to my mind in its wording is rather indefinite in some respects. There has been no opportunity to work that out in committee. I am just not certain what those provisions carry or what they provide for in the Case bill which I am seeking to strike out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That there may be no misunderstanding, is the power of subpoena and the cooling-off period in the provision which you offer as an amendment?

Mr. BELL. No; I think that was stricken out in committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is it in or out?

Mr. BELL. That was stricken out, as I understand, in committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Do you propose to put it back in?

Mr. BELL. Not in this amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAILLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think when we understand what the issue is here, the committee will not be very long in voting down this proposal.

In the first place, it seeks to write into the bill provisions that apparently no one on the Labor Committee favors, although they did report it.

Secondly, it raises the specific question between a strengthening of the processes of mediation and conciliation, the offering of the good services of Government to try to get management and men together when they are in disagreement, as against setting up of so-called fact-finding boards, empowered and directed to inquire into the facts involved and to make public recommendations thereon as to settlement.

I believe in collective bargaining. I think those processes should be strengthened. I do not believe we should have substitution of governmental decision for free agreement, through the processes of collective bargaining. One of the things that has disturbed me about this whole fact-finding proposition is that the making of decisions by fact-finding boards may be carried to the point where, in truth and in fact, we have a substitution of governmental decision for free agreement. Neither management nor labor wants that.

The proposal of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] sets up the power to intervene after conciliation and mediation have failed. The Case bill would start with mediation and conciliation, and finish up with voluntary arbitration; and beyond that it would not go.

As bearing upon the question of whether we should have another agency or whether it should be in the Department of Labor—and what I am about to say applies with equal force against the Adams substitute that would set up mediation and conciliation in the Department of Labor—my view is that if this agency is to accomplish any real good, then it must not be the special pleader of either side. It must, by its activities, by its conduct, and by its action, unprejudiced and unbiased, always maintain itself in such position that it can go to the two sides of the controversy and say to either side, "Gentlemen, how about this as a matter of settlement?"

I think it is fair to say, and it is no challenge of the propriety of the arrangement, that the Department of Labor is

set up as something of a champion of labor. As I understand it, that is its purpose. If that is true, then does it not follow that the mediation and conciliation service, if it is to be most effective, must be free from any suspicion of bias or prejudice. Should it not be set up to carry on this service that the Government offers, to try to bring its people together through the processes of collective bargaining, in which we all believe on the best possible basis. Why should we desert the mediation and conciliation sections that are in the Case bill, with a well-set-up agency to do this job, and go back to this proposition that apparently has few supporters, if any, anywhere?

Some suggestion is made about the fact that this board would be permanent. Yes; that is true as to the chairman, the vice chairman, and the secretary; but there is left in the provisions of the bill provision for flexibility by which the President can from time to time increase or decrease the size of the over-all establishment to meet the necessities at any given time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri. The amendment was rejected.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LANDIS:

Page 6, line 10, after the word "appropriate" insert the following: "Provided, however, This provision shall not apply to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Federal Social Security Agency, or any other department or agency of the Government which holds as confidential any and all information submitted to it."

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman, management is dead set against the use of the power of subpoena to obtain books and records. Labor is likewise opposed to turning their books and records to a group of fact finders.

If you give several hundred Federal workers the power of subpoena to obtain books and records, you will eliminate free competition—business secrets would be no longer secret. When you eliminate free competition in industry, private enterprise is gone.

Labor objects to the power to subpoena books and records of their organization because it would expose their financial standing to their employers.

I have opposed the power of subpoena in committee. I am opposed to the heavy hand of the Federal Government, when it steps into the breach, requiring that collective-bargaining agreement shall be based upon the employer's ability to pay. Obviously some employers are better able to pay a high wage scale than others. Would you place a premium upon lack of thrift? Would you stifle initiative and business ingenuity which in large part has made this Republic the wonder of the world?

In case of doubt that under the section here on page 6 they could go into the Bureau of Internal Revenue and get confidential information out of it, I wanted to make clear that this could

not be done by a mediation board or members of a mediation board or the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt the Committee divided and there were—yeas 64, noes 35.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. PATTERSON] has an amendment at the desk which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATTERSON: Page 3, after the word "arbitration" in line 18, strike out all the balance of page 3 and all of pages 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect the Committee to adopt this amendment; however, I have listened now for 4 days to the debate and I have noticed particularly the Republican Party in confusion and disagreeing among themselves, not knowing exactly what they want to do and not knowing where the bill was conceived or thought of. I think the best thing to do is to take you at your word when you declared a very sensible policy.

The declaration of policy is very good. It says that you are for collective bargaining, which is a good thing. You say that you are for mutuality of obligation of contracts, which is already the law in every State in the Union. You say you are against violence. We are all against violence. Violence can be put down in any State of the Union. You have laws to protect labor and industry in every State of the Union in this regard, so there is no reason for duplication of legislation.

You refused, wisely I think, to declare that a labor union should be a corporation any more than you would want industry or management to be forced into being a corporation. You were fair enough in that regard and I want to compliment you on it because I recognize you want to treat labor the same as you do management as far as forcing them to do something against their will, which would probably be an unconstitutional gesture against both management and labor.

Then you begin to do what you say you do not want to do. You say that you do not want to regiment labor, you say that you do not want to bring about governmental control of labor or management; you say you want less government in industry. You are doing, though, what they tried to do in Australia but it did not work. I have been down to Australia, I have talked to some of the governmental officials who have compulsory arbitration. Even the court decisions against labor and management are not upheld in Australia because Australia is still a democracy. We are still a democracy here. You say also, and very justly, that you are against forced labor, which means involuntary servitude, and I am glad you had the wisdom to strike that from the books because it would have been uncon-

stitutional if you had left it in there. You recognize you cannot force a man to work against his will. You also recognize you cannot force a man to stay in business against his will. You recognize also that free competition takes care of this situation. For instance, General Motors refused to settle with labor, and still is refusing to settle with labor over 1½ cents or 2 cents or thereabouts, which is a ridiculous amount to hold out on when you say the country is in danger. You say General Motors will not settle and you say labor will not settle with General Motors. So what? Suppose management and labor are stubborn in regard to the settlement of their disputes, private competition will take care of that.

Kaiser, Chrysler, and all the other automobile companies in America, and every other company that is not so stubborn will take care of the situation and General Motors will go out of business. Other companies, through competition and free enterprise, will take over. Why not? That is the American way, and that is the way you say you are for; yet you come in here and introduce a bill, conceived in haste by some member of the Republican Party. I have listened to representatives of labor and of industry testify before the Labor Committee, and I agree with them to this extent that you cannot have involuntary servitude in the United States of America and have democracy. That is true in regard to involuntary servitude, whether you force this concept on labor or industry, and it will not work. Therefore, I say that the only thing good about this Case bill is the declaration of policy; that it stands for the right to collective bargaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. I wish you were sincere in it, for this reason. Then you go right ahead and do everything that is humanly possible to cut labor's right and management's right to collective bargaining right out from under, after you say you are for it. I do not understand your reasoning or your philosophy.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATTERSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. That is typical of the ridiculous statements that are made concerning the position of several of us on this legislation. The gentleman just got through saying that a number of things were taken out that made this bill better from his standpoint. Then he says that somebody has done everything humanly possible to make it as bad as possible.

Mr. PATTERSON. As a whole, I said that you have done very little in perfecting this bill. I do not say that you have made it as good as possible; no. I still think it is a very, very bad and dangerous bill. Furthermore, you know it will

not pass the Senate. You know it is a political gesture here, and you know the President will not sign it.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, nobody is more opposed to the Case bill than I am. I made a speech against it and against this legislation the minute we opened general debate. But I believe in a fair fight, and I believe that those who sincerely think that this bill is an answer to the question have a right to express their points of view and not be criticized for doing it. There are Members on that side of the aisle, the majority side, in the Democratic Party, Mr. Chairman, who control this House and every committee in it, who have taken the attitude that they want to see what the Republicans are going to do. Well, here is one Republican that is going to protest this bill, vote against it, fight against it, but I am willing to do it in a fair fight and listen to the arguments on the other side. Do not let us have any nonsense of lying down on either side of the aisle when it comes to a vote on this measure.

Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly convinced that this legislation is going to be a repetition of the Smith-Connally Act. I think that the Labor Committee should have been allowed to study this bill. I think public hearings should have been held on it. You can say that we have delayed, delayed, and delayed. I made a pledge here the last time I spoke for the Smith-Connally bill repeal when I said I was convinced that the Labor Committee would bring out something that we could debate, and they did bring out something that we could debate.

I now repeat that pledge. If we had had a chance to study this legislation and had a committee to go into the whole question of labor-management relations, we would have something in due time. My distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan at one point said he thought the matter could be handled by amending the Wagner Act. I think certain reasonable amendments to the Wagner Act might solve this problem. However, nothing will solve the immediate strike problem except leadership; leadership down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue or elsewhere; leadership on the part of labor and management. You know that as well as I do. The bills we pass here are not going to solve the current strike situation, and what we do in the future should be carefully studied and carefully analyzed, and after bringing in a bill we should hear arguments and make it as adaptable as possible so that whenever it comes to a vote we will know what we are voting on.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I want to say to the Members of this House that if it had not been for the vote of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] we would never have brought anything out here.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to accept that statement. I made a promise here on the floor of this House that, as

far as I was concerned, I would see that the House, and consequently the public generally, would have a chance to debate this question. It seems to me that was reasonable and proper. It does not change one iota my own personal feelings and my own conviction that we are legislating here too hastily in going about it in a few days, as we did with the Smith-Connally bill. And you can read the record of what I said when the Smith-Connally bill was passed. I said it was going to increase strikes, upset management, and do all the things we did not want it to do. I say the same thing now; that is exactly what is going to happen here now if we pass this legislation without proper committee consideration.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman speaking is courageous now as he always is within the committee on which I am privileged to serve with him, regardless of his viewpoint, which is not in issue. Does the gentleman feel that it would be better for this House to deal with the economic unrest during a period of reconversion rather than attempt to write here on the floor over-all legislation dealing with labor and management?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I definitely do, Mr. Chairman. I do not think that ever in times of stress and excitement proper legislation is forthcoming. I think the thing should be considered calmly after the event or sometime before the event, that the committee should have a chance and the public should have a chance to study the legislation that we attempt to pass here, before it becomes permanent legislation.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Would the gentleman announce his position on the President's original request?

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. I am opposed to the President's original request. I stated that in the committee and I state it here again. I support the proposal that was also presented in committee, that we should have our committee get some funds and counsel to make a really fundamental study of labor-management relations and pass fundamental law, taking time to do it. This would have been the sensible approach to the problem. I voted for that in committee and it was beaten.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it is seldom that I find myself in agreement with my good friend from New York [Mr. BALDWIN]. He made the statement that if we did not look out we were going to be in the same fix about this bill that we were about the Smith-Connally bill. I am in thorough accord with that statement. I just want to remind the House of the history of that piece of legislation.

When that bill passed the House it had provisions in it that would have accomplished the purpose intended of minimizing strikes in defense industry. But the same thing happened there that has been threatening here all day, the effort, and the repeated and consistent

effort, to one by one draw its teeth. If you do that to this bill, as the effort has been made to do here today, you are going to have a bill that will not accomplish the purpose the House expects. That is what happened to the Connally-Smith bill. It was a good bill when it passed the House, and when it got back here from the Senate conference all the teeth had been drawn. I hope you will not do that to this bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I take this occasion simply to call to the attention of the House the fact that we do not have the happy alternative suggested by my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN]. We just have not been given the opportunity to consider strike legislation at a time when there is not a period of stress or strain. These strikes happen to be causing a most serious condition at the present time. There was nothing done before the strikes took place to make it possible for the proper kind of settlement to be provided by Government action. Certainly the third point of the dilemma proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN], we cannot await, and that is until business and labor both reach such an unhappy state of bankruptcy that they both urge Congress to meet the problem now confronting us. Consequently, I urge the defeat of the Patterson amendment and urge we continue here on the House floor to do our best to establish a working legislative formula for establishing and maintaining industrial equity and peace.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Were the steel strike and the General Motors strike announced just before the strikes happened, or were they forewarned several months before they happened?

Mr. MUNDT. I think they were forewarned. The fact remains that the Committee on Labor did not bring out a bill to meet the challenge of those impending strikes, consequently we are forced to meet the situation here on the floor of the House with the bill suggested by my good colleague from South Dakota, and constructed by Members on both sides of the aisle over the period of many months and by amendments here and now on the House floor.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. The Committee on Labor was holding hearings, the Committee on Labor was hoping to do something on this matter without its hand being forced by public pressure. I think if the committee had been given more time it might have brought out intelligent legislation. In order to have a debate in this House, we brought out what in my opinion is a blank piece of paper. I voted to bring it out, announcing I would oppose it on the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. I think probably if the Committee on Labor had been given sufficient time, something might have emanated therefrom. But it is beyond me to determine what that sufficient amount of time might have to be because in the nearly 8 years I have been here, the

Committee on Labor has been holding hearings almost every session and still no legislation has come forth to provide a good industrial-relations program between labor and capital in this country. I am sure there is no disposition on the part of either side of this House to pass antilabor legislation, but there now is a very vigorous disposition to pass legislation which will establish working machinery for creating and continuing peaceful, just, and productive industrial relations.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COX. I have the feeling there are many Members of the House who are indebted to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BALDWIN] for having declared his position on this proposal, because it makes it easier for them to decide as to what would be the proper vote on the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with the gentleman. We certainly are indebted to him for having cast the vote which makes it possible for us here in the Committee of the Whole House to discuss the entire strike problem. I agree with what one gentleman said earlier today. I think it was the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], that the Committee of the Whole House is the best, the most significant, and most important Committee of the Congress and that this is not such a bad place to write legislation after all.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Having made that observation of the relative value of committees, are you willing to submit the questions which come before the Committee on Foreign Affairs to the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. MUNDT. We always do because we arrive at a committee conclusion and bring out a bill, invariably with an open rule, so that the Committee of the Whole has precisely the same opportunity with such legislation to amend and refine it as we are having today to amend and refine the legislation now before us for the purpose of alleviating industrial disorders.

Mr. Chairman, the great consuming public of America, our returning veterans, our farmers, the honest, hard-working people of our towns and cities have had enough and too much of the bickering and name-calling going on between capital and labor. They have had enough and too much of strikes and work stoppages which prolong existing scarcities and magnify the problems of inadequate clothing, insufficient housing, and a hundred and one other shortages which are crippling the reconversion efforts of this Republic.

President Truman has done nothing effective to remedy this serious situation; the Labor Committee has failed to bring out legislation fashioned to correct conditions. Consequently, this House is right in facing up to the responsibilities which now confront it. We should proceed calmly and dispassionately to write labor legislation which is

fair alike to labor and to capital but which goes to the heart of the serious labor disturbances now strait-jacketing recovery and reconversion in this country. We should stick with this problem until by our collective good judgment we can develop and evolve an industrial relations act which finds some other way to settle industrial disputes other than the tidal wave of strikes now handicapping every region of this country and encouraging the onrush of inflation with all of its evil consequences.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the Patterson amendment now before us which would make a mockery of the present legislation. Let us amend and refine and correct the so-called Case bill as much as necessary to make it the most effective and the most equitable in the minds of the most Members of this body and then let us enact it into legislation and send it along to the Senate for further consideration. But let us not turn back from our tasks by adopting such a complete repealer as the Patterson proposal.

Some corrective amendments have already been adopted to the Case bill and others are about to be presented in the course of the consideration of this legislation. Let us test and measure each suggested amendment by its workability, its equity, and its efficacy but let us continue to grapple with this problem until we have evolved the best industrial relations legislation of which we are collectively capable.

With fairness toward all and malice toward none, we can thus succeed where the White House has failed. We can succeed in establishing a formula whereby employers and employees can find a way to adjust their differences through collective bargaining which in its attempt to provide justice for each side also will recognize that the general public has an interest in such settlements and that its interest, too, is entitled to consideration.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman proceeds, in an effort to find the best policy for the House to pursue at this hour in the afternoon, I am wondering whether it would be advisable to see if we can arrived at a definite period for debate on the Case amendment and all amendments thereto. I wonder what the feeling of the membership would be as to my making a formal request in that respect.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do I understand correctly that the Adams substitute which has been offered to the Case bill can be followed by other substitutes for the Case bill? I wonder whether or not the gentleman's idea is to include all of the substitutes that may be offered for the Case bill or merely refers to the Case bill exclusively.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should like to say that as a legislative son I am usually very happy to follow my legislative fathers, because I have confidence in them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That answers my question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The thought entered my mind that the Adams substitute is pending, and that if the motion is carried to close debate on the Case amendment and all amendments thereto, that would preclude any other Member from debating another substitute for the Case amendment. I believe that if any limitation that may be imposed on the debate, it might be confined exclusively to the Adams amendment. Of course, that would be a different matter. If it is not confined exclusively to the Adams amendment, then some other Member might want to offer a substitute for the Case amendment and thus would be cut off from the opportunity to debate it.

Mr. HINSHAW. My understanding of the request was that it was for limitation of time on the Case substitute. At the moment, the only amendments that are in order are amendments to the Case substitute. It would seem to me we could reach some agreement as to when we might conclude the perfection of the Case substitute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request, if it was a request.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What amendment is now pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The Case bill as an original amendment is being considered for amendment. There is a substitute, the Adams bill, which is subject to amendment. If the Adams substitute is defeated, any other bill by way of amendment would be in order to the Case amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The inquiry I sought to submit was, What specific amendment was pending at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PATTERSON] is pending at this time. A vote has not been taken on the Patterson amendment but will be taken following the remarks by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PATTERSON. We can have a vote on it now, if you want to.

Mr. GREEN. I would rather you waited until I spoke, because what I have to say may have a great bearing on the outcome of the vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, being a freshman Member of Congress, and being a member of the Labor Committee sitting here for the last 4 days listening to the oratory on both sides of the House about the lack of work which the Labor Committee does, I have been very much amused. As a member of that committee I think I have been quite active in the House and the committee.

The history of the legislation that is before us today, in a confusing way, is very comical. Shortly after the President delivered his message requesting that fact-finding boards be set up, there

was a bill introduced by the distinguished chairlady of the Labor Committee, the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]. Two or three days later we held hearings.

First of all, before we held hearings, we had the Military Affairs Committee walking up and down outside our committee room with their rifles.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MAY. I understand, of course, that perhaps the gentleman is speaking ironically about the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MAY. I do not propose to stand here and permit that kind of a statement to go into the RECORD that the House Military Affairs Committee was walking up and down outside the committee room with rifles.

Mr. GREEN. That statement is absolutely true, because the chairman, as the newspapers stated, said they were going to see what the Labor Committee did.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. I ask that the gentleman's remarks be taken down and expunged from the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will take his seat.

The gentleman from Kentucky will state the words complained of.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will proceed.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee I want to say that I resent the remarks the gentleman just made. That was a popgun that I was carrying.

Mr. GREEN. What I am trying to do is just to give you a history of the background of this legislation to show you what position the other Members of the House put the Labor Committee in every time any piece of legislation is before the Labor Committee. I said in the committee that I felt like someone with a pistol at his head but that I did not scare so easily.

The outcome was we had the May-Arends bill brought out on the floor by the Rules Committee and it was defeated on the rule. And justly so.

We had before our committee John L. Lewis, Philip Murray, William Green, all the leaders of organized labor. We had Ira Moser, head of the National Association of Manufacturers; we had Eric Johnston, former head of the chamber of commerce. Not one of those was in favor of this piece of legislation and warned against legislating in haste.

We had voted in the committee to continue hearings on fact finding. After we returned from our recess we held another committee meeting and reported out, although I voted against it, the piece of legislation that went to the Rules Committee. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr.

BALDWIN], who is always vigorous in his support, felt that that legislation should have an opportunity on the floor. I think that was very admirable of him.

The previous speaker said it was fine to have this discussion on the floor about legislation. Why can we not have discussion about FEPC legislation like this on the floor. That was reported out of the Labor Committee. Is it not funny that that does not get to the floor? Oh, when you throw a piece of meat in to a lot of wolves they certainly tear each other apart in order to get a portion of it. That is what is happening here. Labor baiters are having a field day.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. I do not want a piece of it; I do not want any part of it. I was against the fact-finding bill, I am against the Case bill. I do not know what this is going to look like when it is finished, but I will be against it because I do not think this is the proper way to write legislation that is so important and I do not believe its supporters do either. How are they going to vote on the proposition of letting certain liberal legislation reach this floor that has been pending in committee for months?

THE OTHER POINTS IN PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S PROGRAM

Now we will talk about the serious things that are before Congress. I do not receive a great deal of mail about the so-called terrible strikes that are going on all over the country but I do get a lot of mail about demobilization. I do not, however, see any bill coming out of the Committee on Military Affairs dealing with demobilization. What is being done about that? Why do we not get the fathers with children at home out of the Army? You know it was the policy of Hitler to take the young men out of Poland and France to cut down the birth rate in those countries.

Excuse me for digressing.

We hear much about free enterprise and much about the competitive system.

Responsibility of management. Free enterprise! Competitive systems! Bunk! Bunk! Does anyone have even the slightest idea that there is any comparison between the competitive system as known to the founding fathers of this country and the way it is done now? There is as much similarity as there is between a water pistol and the atomic bomb.

Sure, we still have competition. Competition so vastly changed that the old boys would scarcely recognize it.

We have a market place today as there was in the first decade of our Republic, but the prices that prevail there today are not by and large the automatic prices our forefathers knew. Some of which approximate the definition of automatic, some of which are administered, and

then we have the monopoly prices of the various types of prices prevailing in our economy today. The administered price is easily the most characteristic. This price is not based primarily on the law of supply and demand, operating freely in the market place, but on the judgment of corporation officials. These gentlemen estimate the cost of the product they make, the probable demand at various price levels, and then fix on the one that is calculated to maximize profits. If their estimate of sales turns out to be overoptimistic they reduce the volume of production, not the price. Under this system, despite the law of supply and demand, prices tend to remain relatively inflexible. This system exists with the automobile industry, dominated by three giant concerns.

Thus such phrases as "free competition" and "the system of competitive enterprise" cannot be applied in the same sense to American business today as to business in the pre-Civil War period.

When GM refuses to cooperate with the Government fact-finding board on the ground that the American competitive system would be doomed, it is not defending something hallowed by history and blessed by the founding fathers. It is fighting to preserve a system that is competitive only in a very special and very modern sense.

With the same token there is some truth in the idea that the responsibility of management has been the keystone of American business. Yesterday, yes—today, no.

In the early days of this country business management was closely associated with ownership. Most businesses were small and the owners generally managed them in person; in most cases worked side by side with employees. They exercised a responsibility which everyone understood and approved—the responsibility associated with ownership, a responsibility that was severely restricted and disciplined by a free and competitive market place. They were in no position by reason of being managers of a business to make decisions on wages, prices, and profits that would have far-reaching effects on the livelihood of their fellow citizens.

We have many thousands of small businessmen today that operate along the same lines but they have ceased to be a dominant factor in modern economic life. The dominant factor today is the huge corporation, the industrial empire and the dominant persons in this set-up are not the owners, but hired managers.

The average stockholder has no control over his property and little sense of responsibility for it. It is not unfair to describe American business today as a system in which ownership and responsibility have been effectively divorced. The result has been the enthronement of hired managers and these men are in a position to affect the lives of millions of people. They are not rigidly confined by the law of supply and demand operating in a free market place. They can administer prices and gear production to support those prices.

Nothing is quite so useless as fighting over slogans which have lost their orig-

inal meaning. We are being invited to defend "free enterprisc," "the American competitive system," "right of management to manage." Before setting our sights, let us make sure we know what this fight is all about.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the 15 years I have been a Member of this great body I have tried to so conduct myself that I would not subject any of my colleagues to criticism or give them cause to criticize me. I have had some pride, and I have it now, in having been permitted by my constituents and by the pleasure of the Congress of the United States to serve as chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee during the last 8 years, covering several years before the beginning of this desperate war in which we are now engaged. Having that pride in the position that I hold, I want to pay tribute, if I may, to the Committee on Labor as a whole. I am particularly glad to pay tribute to my splendid colleague from the State of West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has been specially courteous and considerate of everyone. I know as acting chairman of the Labor Committee, he has sought earnestly to have reported worth while labor legislation and I commend him.

I remember that my committee was subjected to the necessity of dealing with and bringing to the House floor the Smith-Connally bill, and the only reason why we were here with it recently was because it had become necessary that it be repealed, and the bill known as the May-Arends bill would have repealed several provisions of that act; in fact, it repealed it outright except the provision that still authorizes the President to maintain the War Labor Board until the end of the year.

Now, the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—and I can excuse him because he says he is a freshman—that the House Committee on Military Affairs was marching up and down the hall with guns and bayonets in order to force the Committee on Labor to bring something to the floor, ought not to go in a public record for the people of the country to read, and to think that committees of Congress are up in arms against each other, and that is the reason why I objected to his words. I withdrew them at the request of the leadership. Now I take it that he was merely facetious in that remark. But I would like to observe on the pending amendment which strikes out everything in the Case bill except the declaration of policy in section 1 that it will probably make the Case bill, even though it was all stricken out except the policy section, a better bill than the Committee on Labor bill, because it does declare something of substance.

Now I am going to vote for the Case bill. I am going to do it because there is no other alternative. The Committee on Labor has brought us a bill that none of its Members will sponsor, and I take the position that that being true, with that great committee having studied that bill, that it condemns it itself, and that I am entitled to vote against it, and hav-

ing nothing else to vote for except the Case substitute, with whatever amendments may be adopted on it, I shall vote for the Case bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Maybe the gentleman's opinion of the Committee on Labor is not any better than my own opinion, but the Committee on Labor did something that the Committee on Military Affairs was never able to do, and that was to give the House a chance to vote on a bill.

Mr. MAY. We have never failed to bring out any bill that we had jurisdiction of, and we brought out the bill to repeal the War Labor Disputes Act, and the gentleman had the opportunity to vote on a rule on it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about the May-Arends bill?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman, I expect, voted against it. I believe he voted against us consistently.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BALDWIN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I regret as much as the gentleman does any bickering as between committees. But is it not true that the Committee on Military Affairs, which had under its jurisdiction the Smith-Connally bill and the May-Arends bill, when the rule for that bill was defeated, publicly stated, or if not publicly, certainly to me privately, that if the Committee on Labor did not act, they would reproduce that May-Arends bill for consideration by the House? I think perhaps my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, had that in mind when he talked about a military parade in front of the Committee on Military Affairs' door.

Mr. MAY. May I say to the gentleman that his question is rather complicated, but I think I can answer it. We brought out that which was referred to us, by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, with amendments. And certainly considering the past performance of the Labor Committee, perhaps someone or some group should have done something to get something reported, for surely everyone familiar with proceedings in this House knows that until the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] took charge that committee has been on a sit-down strike.

Mrs. DOUGLAS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be a freshman, but I think he has gone to the heart of the matter. There has been confusion here today and yesterday because we are not talking to the issue. The issue is not strikes. The issue is a subsistence wage. Strikes are the last desperate expression of men and women in showing their needs. Strikes are no picnic. You cannot say it is just a few labor leaders. It is 2,000,000 men and women who say they cannot work for what they are get-

ting. They say they are not getting a subsistence wage. For instance, in the GM strike there are 40,000 women of middle age with families who are among those on strike—not because they like it, but because they cannot live on what they are getting. It is not a lot of big bruiser men that just want to get out and have fistcuffs with people just for the joy of striking. And if you look over the lists, as I have in the General Motors strike, you will find veteran after veteran being turned out of his home with his family. The issue is not strikes, but food, rent, clothing, doctors, orange juice. Strikes are not pleasant things. They are the most heartbreaking experience that people with no resources can go through. We will not settle the real issue confronting us by passing the kind of legislation we are discussing here, and I think we all know it.

It is as though you had a boiling teakettle on the stove and you wanted to stop the steam, so you stick your thumb in the spout. You do not stop the steam, but you do blow the top off the teakettle and burn your finger. The way you stop the steam is to turn the stove off. The way to stop strikes is to get at the root of the trouble.

It reminds me of what Lincoln said, and I think that is the issue involved here:

It is the same principle in whatever shape it develops itself. It is the same spirit that says, "You toil and work and earn the bread and I will eat it."

No matter in what shape it comes, whether from the mouth of the king who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live by the fruit of their labor or from one race of men as an apology for enslaving another race, it is the same tyrannical principle. If Lincoln had lived today, he might have said, "Whether it be an economic king or a corporation who seeks to bestride the people of his own nation and live on the fruit of their labor, it is the same tyrannical principle."

Nobody is against profits. I think we ought to make all the profits we can make, but not when it comes out of the stomachs of men and women. The question is, in this transition period—and I do not think the issue has been met squarely—in this twilight period between war and peace, if we are to keep down inflation, which is going to do nobody any good, anyway, who is going to pay the cost? Is it going to be paid out of the excess war profits that have been stored up or out of the stomachs of men and women? I say it ought to come out of the profits.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PATTERSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK: On page 8 of the Case amendment, line 2, after "less than", strike out "fifty" and insert "two hundred and fifty."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I have a little difficulty in understanding the

position of some of the extreme opposition to these various proposals before us. Some of the Members violently in opposition will say before the Rules Committee and they will say here that they think contracts should be binding. They say that is just, decent, and fair. But somehow or other they are just against anything that tries to make contracts binding.

They will say, "We are for law and order. We do not think that people should have their heads bashed in, their automobiles turned over, that assault and battery should be committed, that malicious trespass should be committed. We are against that." But when you try to do something about it, they are just against it.

Some of my radical friends on the other side of the aisle who have been voicing such preposterous and absurd criticisms of all the proposals before us, including the proposal of President Truman, have tried to create the impression that here in the House we do not know what we are about. Now, if they want to plead guilty to not knowing what they are about, that is all right with me, but for myself I am not going to so plead. If they do not know what has been going on here, it is because they have not read the various proposals that have been before us for days and days—yes, and because they have not been paying any attention to the debate.

As a matter of fact, I would like the country to know, I would like those who scoff at Congress as an institution, to know that the last days here in the House of Representatives have been about the best exposition of representative government in action that I have seen in my time in Congress. I think the address just made by the gentleman from California was listened to as intently as any I have heard here in a long time. Why, look around you. Yesterday and today as we have read this bill and considered various proposals, we have had on the floor a greater number of our membership than I have seen here for the consideration of any proposal in a long, long time. Is that not true? Who will deny it?

The President sent a message to Congress asking us to do something. He outlined his program. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania said he was against it. The President said, "If you do not like this, then do something." Now, right or wrong, that is exactly what the House of Representatives is doing. That is what the overwhelming majority of the people of the country want us to do. I am not going to plead guilty to such a lack of intelligence and character, understanding and integrity in the membership of the House of Representatives as would lead the people to believe there is not enough collective good judgment here to approach this matter with discretion, in fairness, and in equity, in an effort to try and get something done.

I have offered this amendment as a part of the process of trying to harmonize judgment and viewpoints and get some legislation that will be workable.

I would like to say this further, in respect to some of my aforesaid friends

whom I have been talking about—they seem to know exactly what they are doing. It rather amuses me although some of its aspects are downright tragic. They apparently are refusing to join in an effort to work out fair, equitable, and proper legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. Do you suggest and go on record as in favor of repealing the whole committee system and bringing every single bill out here—perhaps I would not be averse to it—and consider legislation which you are holding up here that President Truman also asked for? He asked for 14 or 15 major pieces of legislation. Are you for bringing those out here and discussing them and abolishing the committee system?

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, I am not for abolishing the committee system.

Mr. PATTERSON. Why do you make such a speech, then?

Mr. HALLECK. Now, you have asked a question. Let me answer it. I never have been prone to indulge in any criticism of committees. I recognize that every member of a committee in the House of Representatives carries great responsibility. But let me say this to the gentleman: Reference has been made to the action of the Labor Committee on this legislation. Reference has been made to the vote on the rule on the May-Arends bill. The gentleman should know, if he does not know, that that rule was defeated in order to give the Labor Committee a chance to consider this matter.

Now, more specifically, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] who spoke a moment ago, is, I understand, a member of the Labor Committee. What assurance—yes, less than assurance—what indication could any of us have that anything would be forthcoming from the Labor Committee when he, as a member of it, stands here and announces that he is "just 'agin' anything and everything?"

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, I will yield, I mentioned the gentleman's name.

Mr. GREEN. I did not say that I was against anything. I said I was against the fact-finding bill. I was against the Case bill. The procedure you are using in the House to write a bill is not the proper procedure. You stand here and you are for everything that is good and holy and you are against sin, but you come in with a closed rule on amendments to the Smith-Connally bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman, because I want to call to the gentleman's attention the fact that when he said he was against the committee bill and against the Presi-

dent's proposal and against the Case bill, he also said, "I don't know what is going to happen to the Case bill, but I am 'agin' it." If that is not saying you are "agin' everything and anything, I cannot understand the English language.

Now, I do not yield further, Mr. Chairman.

I referred to some of the strange antics that have been going on. This is what I mean: Some of these good friends of mine on the other side of the aisle complain bitterly of the inclusion of certain provisions for injunctive relief, yet when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY], with support of many of us, offered an amendment to strike injunctive action from the contract section of the bill, they voted against that amendment. Some of them even voted for an amendment to require labor unions to incorporate. I know very well they do not believe in that.

Now, to get down to this particular amendment which I have offered, the bill as drafted provided that these mediation and conciliation operations should go into effect as to the provisions therein contained in respect to employers having 50 or more employees. Obviously, that was put in there as some guide in respect to a determination of the matter of public interest involved, because it is contemplated that the procedures provided for in this section shall be invoked when the public interest is involved. My view is that that figure of 50 is too low. I think it should be 250. I recognize that many disputes between management and men in plants of a less number than 250 employees could have serious consequences for communities, for the men, and for management, but, on the other hand, having regard to the fact that what we are trying to do here is to invoke these procedures when great fundamental public interest is involved, I think the figure should be raised. It should be understood that this amendment applies only to the mediation and conciliation sections of the bill. I believe, in addition to that, it will be understood that the processes of mediation and conciliation as a voluntary matter as offered in controversies would still be available, but this would make the limit apply to those procedures that are outlined definitely in the bill and about which we have had so much discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 12 of the Case bill strike out all of section 11 down to and including the word "provisions" in line 2 of page 13 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 11. Violence and intimidation: (a) Whenever any act mentioned in this or any subsequent section shall obstruct or interfere with interstate or foreign commerce—

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person, alone or acting with another or others, directly or indirectly, by force, coercion, intimidation, or by show or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to force or attempt to force any person to become, be, or remain a

member of any labor organization; or, by force, coercion, intimidation, or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to force or attempt to force any person to refrain from engaging, or remaining in employment, or by force, coercion, intimidation, or by show or threat of force, or attempt to use force, to interfere or attempt to interfere with any employee or other person on his or her way to or from employment, or while seeking employment, which in any way contributes to the production of anything which may become an article of interstate or foreign commerce.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any labor organization or the officers thereof, or for any other organization or the officers thereof, to commit any of the acts herein made unlawful when committed by a person or a group of persons.

"(d) Interference in the manner prescribed in section 1 with each employee or other person is hereby made a separate and distinct offense."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike out section (d) of the amendment which makes each interference a separate act.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order and in the meantime I should like to make an inquiry.

Does this amendment carry any criminal penalties?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. MASON. We have heard in the House for the last 2 days a great deal about the fact that the material in the Case bill is new material. Is it not true that a large part of the material in the Case bill was introduced by the gentleman from Michigan back in 1939? And that practically everything in the Case bill has been introduced by the gentleman and others and has gone to the Labor Committee in the last 6 years?

Mr. HOFFMAN. At one time or another—and some of it before the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not in any way affect the purpose of section 11 insofar as prohibiting violence on the picket line, violence anywhere in connection with any strike or any labor dispute.

What the amendment does is to add a paragraph at the top which relates solely to interstate and foreign commerce, an amendment to sections 5 and 13 which have been accepted by the House.

The other provision in it strikes from the committee bill that language which has to do with the issuing of injunctions, which the House has also accepted with reference to section 10 and section 13.

In the Case bill, in line 17 you have language which makes it an offense for

anyone to, by force or threat, prevent an individual from quitting his work, and that is as it should be, but the section does not prevent the use directly or indirectly of force, coercion, or intimidation or the show or threat of force, to force a man to join a union or to compel him to pay dues, nor does it protect a man from similar tactics when he is seeking employment. The objectives of the section are good, but its provisions do not go far enough.

I do not want to support legislation which prevents or which destroys the right to strike. As I have stated time and again, if men working want to strike let them strike, but let them get out of the way of individuals who want to work.

This bill does prescribe that it shall be unlawful for anyone to use violence on the picket line, or for anyone to interfere with a man on his way to or from his work. Remember, it does not destroy picketing. Men may picket to their heart's content just as long as they do not go over the line and by force or threat of force prevent a man from going to work.

I may say to the gentlemen on the majority side and to those on this side who are opposed to this legislation that last week there was an article in the Washington Daily News of January 23 last by the American Civil Liberties Union condemning those who use force and violence on the picket line. This amendment goes no further than did that comment by the American Civil Liberties Union and which reads as follows:

THE RIGHT TO PICKET

The American Civil Liberties Union, an organization always active in defending the rights of workers and other citizens, has sent the following statement to heads of national and local labor unions now engaged in strikes:

"The American Civil Liberties Union has always supported the right to picket at any time, at any place, for any purpose. Picketing, as the courts have held, is a form of free speech and assembly and is supported on that principle.

"The only limitations by public authorities on picketing supported by the union are those to keep traffic open for pedestrians and vehicles, to insure access to places picketed, to prevent the use of fraudulent signs, and to maintain order. The union has supported mass picketing where these conditions are met.

"But no claims of the rights to picket justify the use of force to prevent access to plants on strike by those who are willing to cross picket lines. Reports of current strikes show instances in which pickets have prevented access to plants by executive officers, by maintenance crews keeping up such services as heat and lighting, and by clerical workers not members of the striking union.

"These are plain abuses of the right of picketing. In the view of the American Civil Liberties Union, the right of access, not only of these persons, but of any and all others, is undebatable. The two rights—of picketing and of access to places picketed—are not conflicting.

"The present issue, however, goes further than the right of access to places across a picket line. It affects profoundly the rights of organized labor itself, for wherever the use of force by pickets is successful, public sympathy with unions is alienated and encouragement is given to the opponents of labor's rights.

"These excesses connected with picketing are bound to have a disastrous effect in the long run on the basic right to picket. It is, therefore, greatly in the interest of the unions themselves so to control picketing that access to plants is not denied by force.

"Police efforts to keep access to plants open should be supported by responsible leaders; not resisted as some reports indicate. If they are defied, the inevitable result will be resort to the courts by those aggrieved, with consequent injunctions. Even the statutes protecting labor's legitimate rights from injunctions may thus be endangered."

Here is one other thing: Instead of providing a criminal penalty, the amendment follows the Case bill but also provides that those who crack heads beyond the picket line in an effort to force men to join a union in order to work shall lose their special privileges under the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has made many speeches against force and violence on the picket line.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The Case bill provides for an injunction so that people can get in and out of their places of business.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Why does the gentleman withdraw that?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Because there are so many courts, so many judges, so many different opinions. Also because we can end force and violence, the practice of blocking factory entrances by taking from unions the special privileges given them by the National Labor Relations Act, without which they cannot carry on their intimidation and coercion. All you need to do is to read the press. Here one judge grants an injunction; another judge denies an injunction. You see every day in the paper all those varying opinions. If there is one thing that organized labor depends upon for the preservation of its unions it is the fact that it has special privileges under the National Labor Relations Act and if they resort to force and violence, if they destroy property, if they crack heads, and you take away that special privilege, I say that will stop, because they are dependent upon the exercise of that privilege for their power and existence. The section still makes it unlawful to use force.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Did I understand the amendment included language referring to the threat or an attempt to force somebody to join or not join a union?

Mr. HOFFMAN. It does.

Mr. JUDD. That is beyond the language of section 11. This has only to do with quitting or entering into employment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The language of this bill prevents anyone interfering through force with a man going to his job or coming away from his job.

Mr. JUDD. But the gentleman has the joining or not joining a union here, as I understand it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right. If you want to permit an organizer to go around with a club and tell John Jones, "Now, John, you join the union, or I will crack your head or give you a black eye." You can do it by rejecting this amendment.

Mr. JUDD. I am only asking for information because I think the House should understand it includes that provision which is beyond section 11 of the Case bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes. And while there are some to whom the Case bill is the alpha and the omega of labor legislation, some do not so regard it. The amendment prohibits an organizer or a "goon squad" from doing, as has been done in some of the cities, going to a man's home, throwing a brickbat through a window of his home, threatening his wife or children, in order to force him to join the union or pay his dues.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman offering this amendment loses sight of the real purpose of the bill we are now considering. This bill has been introduced and it will be passed by this House to give expression to the desire and the will of the great majority of the people of this country for industrial peace. It recognizes and undertakes to protect the public interest in seeking to settle fairly and as quickly as possible all labor disputes affecting the public interest to the end that there may be no interruption in the production and distribution of goods that are absolutely essential to the prosperity, happiness, and health of the people of this country. This measure recognizes the right of labor to organize and bargain collectively with employers. It seeks to protect and strengthen collective bargaining. It recognizes the fact that in a complex industrial system such as ours warfare in one branch of industry closes down plants and throws out of employment thousands and sometimes, as now, millions of men and women in other branches of industry.

The bill does not seek to substitute Government dictation for contracts freely entered into between management and ownership on the one hand and their employees on the other. It sets up governmental machinery to promote the peaceful settlement of labor disputes.

Why is it desirable that management and ownership on the one hand and their employees on the other voluntarily negotiate and bargain? In order that they may enter into a contract. Should this contract when made be equally binding and enforceable on both parties? All fair-minded men will readily admit that a contract when it is entered into must not be nullified or destroyed by either employer or employees, whether by a lock-out or a shut-down by an employer, or by willful and unlawful violence on the part of either employer or employees.

Collective bargaining requires that labor be on one side of the table and management on the other side. Manage-

ment has no right to interfere with or invade a labor union, or to undertake to employ officials of labor unions in order to control the actions of such unions.

On the other hand, when management employs a foreman to represent management in the direction and operation of its business, this foreman, as the representative of management, should be true to his trust and represent management.

Section 11 of this act outlaws force, violence, and compulsion on the part of either employer or employee.

The district courts of the United States are given the power to prevent such violence and threats of violence by enjoining the person or persons who are about to commit or who are committing such acts. Congress, in carrying out the will of the great majority of the people of this country, is making a decision for the people through the law and through the enforcement of the law, that this Government of ours shall declare that it has supreme power over all groups of society. Now the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan falls short of attaining one of the main purposes of this bill and that is to prevent the use of violence or force by either side in labor disputes. We are not concerned with the question of whether an employee is or is not a member of a labor union. The question here presented is more important than membership or nonmembership in a union. The question of whether or not a man becomes a member of a union or remains a member of a union is, and properly should be, a matter for him to decide. And we are not undertaking to investigate or police the question of whether or not a man is voluntarily or otherwise joining a union. We are undertaking here to provide methods by which such paralyzing strikes as are now being carried on in the automobile industry and in the steel industry, and as are threatened in other great industries may be avoided; first, through collective bargaining; and second, if that fails, through conciliation, mediation, or through voluntary arbitration. We are engaged in an attempt to accomplish this great purpose, and the gentleman from Michigan is undertaking to lead us from the beaten path off into the woods. I am afraid if he were on a bear hunt and was on the trail of the bear and a mouse crossed his path, he would take off after the mouse.

The high command of the CIO and the leaders of its Political Action Committee are undertaking to take over our system of free economy. They have the run of the White House and are undertaking to dictate to the elected representatives of the people of this Nation what action Congress shall or shall not take with respect to passing laws and setting up machinery to preserve our form of government and our system of free economy by free men and women in a free country.

Mr. Walter P. Reuther, international vice president of the United Automobile Workers, CIO, in his telegram to President Truman on Sunday, February 2, clearly reveals the unprecedented and challenging attitude of this organization in its attempt to seize the industry of this country by the throat and to

browbeat and dominate the President and Congress. Mr. Reuther in his telegram to the President stated that prices and not wages had become the major issue in the country's labor disputes and charged that industry, spearheaded by Steel and the General Motors Corp., is determined to hijack the American people and the American Government into accepting unjustified price increases that would provide the most outrageous profits in history.

Reuther further stated, in effect, that General Motors and other large corporations were resigned to granting wage increases recommended by the President and then he said his organization is ready to accept those recommendations as a down payment on what it is justly and equitably entitled to.

Not content to speak for those he claims to represent in fighting for higher wages, he lays aside that issue as settled in his own mind and steps over into the field of management and undertakes to preempt, occupy, control, and dominate the field of management and ownership in business, and undertakes to tell them at what prices they shall sell their products. Having thus proclaimed himself the boss, not only of labor but of management and business also, he swaggers onto the floor of Congress and demands that the Congress, at his behest, revise the tax laws so as to punish industry and to deprive it of the relief sought to be afforded industries that have suffered losses by undertaking to produce war supplies for this Government and its allies, and to enable industry to convert its plants from war plants into plants to produce the goods that the people of this country now so desperately need, and to enable them to continue to give to the millions of workers of this country profitable employment. And he states to the President of this Nation in ominous and threatening language: "The fight of the General Motors workers is your fight and the fight of every American. It demands your immediate and militant support." In other words, Walter P. Reuther demands of the President of the United States that he dance to Reuther's music and that he abandon his position as Chief Executive of all the people, a position that should be one of impartiality and fairness, and become a partisan of the CIO in its effort to dominate the industry of this country and to seize control of all branches of the Government.

As a matter of fact, the President has subjected himself to an enflaming fire in this matter.

On the one hand, many commentators, columnists, and close observers of his course of action have said he is an ally of the CIO in these movements that have paralyzed the production of this country. On the other hand, Mr. Reuther and other high-ranking labor leaders have charged that the President, as a result of his mild request for authority to appoint fact-finding boards, and in his request for a 30-day cooling-off period, has deserted the cause of labor and become the enemy of the working people.

In Chicago the other day, Mr. Clark, the head of the CIO meat-cutters organ-

ization, denounced the President's action in seizing the meat-packing establishments in Chicago as that of a strike-breaker, and charged that he had double-crossed the meat cutters.

Let us confine ourselves to the purpose of this bill and not be led astray by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. Let us not be deterred by these people who are drunk with power. The people of this country may well ask Mr. Reuther: "Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed that he is grown so great?" By this bill we, as the representatives of all the people, in the discharge of our duty, are determined to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to every man, woman, and child in this Nation.

Mr. DE LACY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I always like to listen to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. He goes on in his smooth, forceful, logical way, generally addressing himself to the meat of the problem, very adroitly twisting tails and telling the House many things that lie behind the legislation that is before us today. But the fact of the matter is that it does not make a great deal of difference how you cut labor's throat. It does not make much difference whether you do it with one bill or another bill, with one amendment or another amendment. The plain fact of the matter is that here is labor today representing the great body of the American people who are trying to keep their living standards up in the face of slashes that have come during this reconversion period. It is not their fault that their wages are lower. It is not their fault that they are out of work. Only half of those employed in 1944 in my congressional district are working today. Now, are those men and women with families supposed to like that situation? They are out of work, and the ones that are working have had their pay cut up to 30 percent. These great strikes that have swept across the face of this Nation are the expressions of the determination of the American people not to yield to that wage cutting, not to yield supinely, not to surrender their livelihood and their bread and their family's welfare to unemployment, to wage cuts. This legislation we have before us today is meant to stab the valiant representatives of the great mass of the American people in the back.

Labor is engaged today in a life-and-death struggle with the most powerful corporations this country has ever seen. This legislation is a stab in the back of those patriotic American men and women who are fighting the battle of the farmers through their efforts to have higher wages, and who are fighting the battle of the consumers against the effort of the great corporations to smash the price levels.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Would the gentleman make about the same statements con-

cerning President Truman's fact-finding proposal?

Mr. DE LACY. I would say that President Truman unfortunately thought he could appease some of the enemies of labor by putting a 30-day cooling-off period in his bill. I think that fact finding is desirable.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman would in effect and substance make about the same statements about the fact-finding proposal sent up here by the President?

Mr. DE LACY. I would say that any effort which weakens labor's bargaining position when it is across the table from the most powerful corporations in America weakens labor and destroys the whole economic position of the American people.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DE LACY. I yield with pleasure.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I hope that the gentleman will not insist that the President of the United States desires to weaken or strengthen any group in this country during the period of reconversion. He said to this Congress and to the American people that during this period of reconversion he wanted the production of essential consumer goods to be made as quickly as possible available to the American people. That is the reason the President's proposal is here. He said for that reason it would be used as an instrumentality only in the extreme cases where the public interest was involved. The gentleman certainly does not want to misconstrue the President's request for legislation.

Mr. DE LACY. I cannot misconstrue the plain provision which puts a curb on labor's power to bargain with the most powerful monopolies in this country. Why do we not get down to business on the full employment bill? Why do not we get down to business on the 65-cent minimum wage bill? Why do we not pass some housing legislation? Why do we not put suits and shirts on the backs of these veterans who are coming back? Why do we not do something to relieve these economic strains instead of trying to fuel the fire which has grown so hot that it has scared some of the distinguished Members on the other side of the aisle. You came in with a bill, a bill to carry us back to the days before the injunction was taken away from the employer-minded courts, one of the most vicious bills I have ever seen. What has happened? You have become so frightened that you are running in 16 directions. It is laughable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the gentleman from Washington who has just spoken, and in particular I paid close attention to one or two of his statements. One statement was to the effect that it does not make any difference how you cut labor's throat as long as you do it. I do not quite know how to interpret that remark. The amendment we are discussing now goes to section 11 which is the

section which seeks to prevent force and violence. It is my own thought, and I would offer the suggestion to the gentleman from Washington, that the man or men who cut the throats of labor are the men who endorse, and who bring about practices which are calculated to bring labor into disrepute. I challenge any Member of this House who is on the floor today who prides himself on being a friend of labor to get up and condone the practice of force and violence. The proposition, of course, is so absurd that no one will do it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield.

Mr. GALLAGHER. You are assuming that labor is the cause of all these strikes. I want to ask you, if the soldier who has been fighting in the Pacific comes and gets the same job that one of the laborers had at this time, would he get the same wages or would he get lower wages?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I have no idea how to answer the gentleman's question, because I do not understand it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think the gentleman should point out just what section 11 does. Is it not a fact that, under section 11, you give the courts the power to enjoin labor from doing things which have been considered sacred since 1932 under the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Why certainly not. The gentleman, good lawyer that he is, does not think that. If he does, he has not read the Norris-LaGuardia Act in some time. Does the gentleman say for one moment that the Norris-LaGuardia Act ever gave anybody the right, title, or patent to the right to resort to violence? Of course not.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Of course not. But it gave labor certain guaranties. Has the gentleman read section 114 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I do not know the number, but I am familiar with the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Does the gentleman say that force and violence should not be restricted? Does the gentleman say that force and violence should not be restricted whether by injunction or by the policeman on the beat or by public opinion, or more important, by the labor leaders themselves, who should be responsive to public opinion and to the welfare of their members?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In answer to the question of the gentleman which he put to me, we say that the issue here is that you are attempting to use a ban against force and violence realistically and in effect to deprive labor of its right to peaceful picketing, its right to advertise, and its right to do everything else.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Apparently the gentleman has not read the section.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. The statement just made by the gentleman from New York,

of course, is one of those statements that involves an opinion to which he has a right, but it is so far-fetched that I am quite sure no one would be taken in by it. Now, I wonder if the gentleman from New York would insist that in any action that the Government ever took it undertook to legalize assault and battery or worse, or malicious trespass or destruction or seizure of property?

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Of course, the answer to the situation is simple. I have heard the question asked dozens of times, in committee rooms and on the floor, of numerous persons who purport to represent labor, and I use the word "purport" advisedly, as to whether they condone force and violence, and they never give you an out-and-out answer because the only answer that decent people would accept is, "No." Instead, they beat around the bush and try to evade the issue. This section merely seeks to prevent these practices which no decent man or woman in this country can condone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, who is the true friend of labor—those who seek to eliminate force and violence, or those who take the position that labor can do no wrong? This morning I received a letter from a laboring man whose home is in Seattle, Wash. He says:

I happen to be a veteran of World War II—just returned—and a member of the Electrical Engineers Union of Seattle, Wash.

The head of our own union has written me in answer to a letter I wrote him on this subject, and he admits that the Wagner Act is all one-sided in labor's favor, and the Smith-Connally Act also. And that the Norris-LaGuardia Act was a mistake, because it prevents injunctions, and the leaders have no way of keeping the outlaws in line if employers can't get injunctions against violent picketing.

Something was said by the gentleman from Washington about hurting labor. Who is hurting labor today? Listen as I read further from this letter:

My wife and I hear white-collar people everywhere, people who don't own businesses or belong to labor unions, but are just workers, and they are sick of strikes and sore as the devil at the union leaders. I don't care where you go, you get it on all sides. They know it's labor-union leadership that is taking the initiative in all these strikes, and then trying to kid the public that they are being forced to strike. Yes, forced to hold their big jobs. They ask me why I still belong to any union, all my friends, and they used to be so sympathetic to labor. But they hate all unions now.

I have been getting a great deal of correspondence, as you may imagine, but here is one from San Francisco, Calif:

I do hope your bill on labor situation will come to a favorable vote as conditions are very bad here on the Pacific coast. There is violence on the picket line nearly every day. I enclose a set of pictures showing a case. Also, strikers follow home workers who are only luke warm toward the strike, and throw creosote stink bombs through their home windows, and in several cases have beaten up men who are not strong enough for the strike.

Often the letters say it is not the workers, not the employees, but persons hired by radical strike leaders simply for the purpose of carrying on the rough stuff.

If you take out this injunction provision, you have no way of getting at the hired racketeers on the picket line. There is no place for the hired thug by either side to an industrial dispute.

Now, as far as the suspension of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is concerned, all we do is to suspend it to get a restraining order on force and violence or threat thereof. We believe their use is an unfair-labor practice. That same thing is provided in the National Labor Relations Act. The National Labor Relations Act carries a section which suspends the Norris-LaGuardia Act in exactly the same language as we have here, if an employer engages in unfair-labor practice.

I submit to you that when violence goes on as described in these letters coming from all over the country, then certainly innocent people who want to go back to work are entitled to the protection of the law against force and violence.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield. Mr. HALLECK. I want it understood that, in my opinion, this amendment should be defeated.

To my mind, the issue here is one of whether or not we are going to do what we can to maintain law and order. The amendment otherwise is objectionable because it seeks to get to the matter of people joining unions or not joining unions. I think that should not be injected here.

For the benefit of those who may not have heard me the other day, the Civil Liberties Union came out with a statement that I would like to read to you, because I think it has an important bearing on this proposition. The Civil Liberties Union certainly has been in the forefront of those who have insisted upon protection of the civil liberties of a citizen. Yes, and some who get so vehement in their opposition to some of these measures might well practice on these occasions, their expressed devotion to the protection of civil liberties.

But no claims of the right to picket justify the use of force to prevent access to plants on strike by those who are willing to cross picket lines. Reports of current strikes show instances in which pickets have prevented access to plants by executive officers, by maintenance crews keeping up such services as heat and lighting, and by clerical workers not members of the striking union.

Then, there is this additional paragraph:

These are plain abuses of the right of picketing. In the view of the American Civil Liberties Union, the right of access, not only of these persons, but of any and all others, is undebatable. The two rights—

And I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] to pay attention to this—

The two rights—of picketing and of access to places picketed—are not conflicting.

I agree with that statement. I do not think it is a fair statement of the problem to accuse anyone who thinks that

something should be done, that what he seeks to do is destroying the right of picketing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Letters from all over the country are telling about incidents where force and violence are used. Here is one from Ohio, where a small bakery man was set upon by 12 men, his delivery truck upset and himself assaulted and beaten up, just because he was delivering the bread he had made, using his own truck.

I urge you to reject the pending amendment; all we are asking is the authority to get restraining orders to protect innocent people from force and violence and threats of violence.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here is an amendment with a great many words. It has just been read once, and nobody knows what it does or what it purports to do, with the exception of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], who offered it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman give me time to explain it to him?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman had 5 minutes to explain it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Everybody seems to be satisfied but you.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not know of anybody who is satisfied.

Now we have, as has been explained here, a provision against violence. There is not any person in this House who is right thinking—

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield.

There is no right-thinking person in this House who will get up on this floor, I believe, and assert the right of labor unions or anybody else to hit somebody over the head with a lead pipe because they want to approach and enter their own premises. If there is I hope he will follow me and justify his opposition.

I had expected assaults against certain features of this bill from many sources in the House, but I did not expect it to come from the gentleman from Michigan, who has been wailing in the wilderness for the correction of these abuses. I can only say to him in the words of Shakespeare: Thou, too, Brutus! I hope the House will defeat his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman just thinks he is the only fellow who knows anything about it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, an effort has been made here by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SLAUGHTER] the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] to make the country believe that the objective of section 11 in the Case bill is to abolish alleged violence in an industrial dispute. That is not the fact. The real objective of section 11 is to destroy the rights of

labor, guaranteed by section 114 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. No amount of smoke screen about violence can change these facts. You say that you seek to prohibit violence, but in fact you seek to enact strike-breaking laws.

We are asked: Are we against violence? Of course, we are all against violence. It is just like asking somebody if he believes in beating his grandmother.

What we are opposed to is the repealing of the guarantees set forth in section 114 of the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act; guarantees of picketing, peaceful assembly, and so forth. The Norris-LaGuardia law specifically states that no court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to issue any restraining order or temporary or permanent injunction in any case involving or growing out of any labor dispute, to prohibit any person or persons participating or interested in such dispute from doing, whether singly or in concert, any of the following acts:

The following are the acts which I again shall put in the Record although I placed them in the Record last Friday:

(a) Ceasing or refusing to perform any work or to remain in any relation of employment;

(b) Becoming or remaining a member of any labor organization or of any employer organization, regardless of any such undertaking or promise as is described in section 3 of this act;

(c) Paying or giving to, or withholding from, any person participating or interested in such labor dispute, any strike or unemployment benefits or insurance, or other moneys or things of value;

(d) By all lawful means aiding any person participating or interested in any labor dispute who is being proceeded against in, or is prosecuting, any action or suit in any court of the United States or of any State;

(e) Giving publicity to the existence of, or the facts involved in, any labor dispute, whether by advertising, speaking, patrolling, or by any other method not involving fraud or violence;

(f) Assembling peaceably to act or to organize to act in promotion of their interests in a labor dispute;

(g) Advising or notifying any person of an intention to do any of the acts heretofore specified;

(h) Agreeing with other persons to do or not to do any of the acts heretofore specified; and

(i) Advising, urging, or otherwise causing or inducing without fraud or violence the acts heretofore specified, regardless of any such undertaking or promise as is described in section 3 of this act.

Let me ask a question of the adroit gentlemen who by this bill now attempt to repeal these sacred provisions whether or not an injunction against violence can be obtained under the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Of course it can. The Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act specifically provides for injunction against violence. Under that law the court can enjoin acts of violence and fraud, but it cannot enjoin certain specific legitimate activities which I have enumerated.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not at this moment.

Let us look at what section 11 does. It gives the courts the power to enjoin labor from exercising any of the rights

enumerated under section 114 of the Norris-LaGuardia law. Here is the trick in this bill, Mr. Chairman: Section 11 states that the court can enjoin against violence in any manner in which it deems appropriate notwithstanding the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act. This is specifically stated on page 12, line 20, of the Case bill. Do you get the trick in it? Or do you not get it? You come here and tell us that you are against violence. Well, the Norris-LaGuardia law provides for injunctions against violence. Then, why section 11? The answer is clear. Your object is not to legislate against violence, but to vitiate labor's rights to conduct a strike, guaranteed under section 114 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. If not, why the following language in this section 11 of this bill, "Notwithstanding the act of March 23, 1932, entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts in equity, and for other purposes.'"

This is the law commonly referred to as the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Yes; why this language? If you do not seek to repeal this Norris-LaGuardia law, if you are not trying to deprive labor of the rights established under this law, if you are not attempting to pass a strike-breaking bill, why do you have the language in section 11 of your bill, which specifically states that the courts can issue orders notwithstanding the Norris-LaGuardia Act? Why? Because in this period of industrial strife you seek to take away every protection that labor has had and give every advantage to the corporations. You say you are opposed to violence. So are we. Violence is provided against in the existing Norris-LaGuardia law. We stand by that law. We are likewise against violence being done to the sacred, fundamental, democratic rights of the working people in these United States. Where do you stand on that? You stand by the language of your section 11 of your bill.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Not at this time.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I wanted to help the gentleman.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The gentleman is supporting section 11. Maybe he has changed his mind now, but I doubt it.

Mr. Chairman, again I repeat, section 11 states that the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction notwithstanding the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code," and so forth. That is the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act. Under section 11 the court can enjoin violations and threatened violations of any of the provisions of the section by appropriate order or decree.

Who decides what is appropriate? The court. It is given the power, under the pretext of enjoining against violence, to enjoin labor from doing any of the things guaranteed under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, because section 11 states that the court may issue any appropriate order notwithstanding the Norris-LaGuardia law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to bargain. I have asked unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes. I would not object to the gentleman if he asked for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I say once again—and I cannot say it too often—get this straight—the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act provides that the courts can enjoin against violence. It provides, though, the courts cannot enjoin against peaceful picketing, against the right of assembly and against the right of advertising a strike. In section 11 of the Case bill, however, you say that the courts can enjoin anything they want to as long as the court deems it appropriate, notwithstanding the guarantees set forth in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The Norris-LaGuardia antiinjunction law gives the courts the power to enjoin against violence, limits the power of the courts, so that the courts cannot enjoin labor from the exercise of certain rights. The Case bill does not limit the courts and gives them the power to enjoin labor from the exercise of its legitimate rights. That is the difference between the Norris-LaGuardia law in section 11. One provides against violence and protects the legitimate and lawful activities of labor; the other provides against violence but leaves labor without protection in carrying on its lawful and legitimate activities. Therefore, do not tell us that you are here to enjoin violence. You have that in the existing law. What you are doing with this bill is to enjoin against the right to strike and continuing that strike in a peaceful manner.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. I know the gentleman wants to be fair. He has enumerated all of these things that the Norris-LaGuardia Act does, but let me direct his attention to page 12 wherein the section provides, does it not, that it shall be unlawful for any person (1) by use of force and violence to prevent or attempt to prevent any individual from quitting or continuing employment, and so forth.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes. But why do you specifically say in section 11, notwithstanding the Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act, and why do you give the court the power to issue any order which it deems appropriate? I will tell you why. Because you want to repeal the right to peaceful picketing. You want to repeal the right to free press and peaceful assemblage. Do not talk of merely seeking to enjoin violence when you speak of section 11.

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Does the gentleman find all that in there?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes; and the language of section 11 tells the story.

The difference between the gentleman and me is that he favors section 11, which destroys labor rights, and I favor the continuance of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which provides for action against violence and also protects labor in its lawful and legitimate endeavors. You are trying to cripple organized labor, and I seek to protect it, when it is striking for a living wage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say as far as violence is concerned that there are 48 States in this Union and every one of them has laws against violence. They are enforced in most cases. Mr. Chairman, if strike legislation such as the Case bill proposes is passed by this House you will see an increase in the price of farm machinery of at least 50 percent. Let some of these farmer supporters of this legislation take note of that.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, I think that if we consider that amendment temperately and coolly we will perceive that it essentially strengthens section 11. Let me point out that it simply supersedes the first two sentences of section 11. All the matter in section 11 beginning on line 2 of page 13 down to the end is preserved in the Hoffman amendment. The Hoffman amendment does strike from section 11 the very dubious provision in the second sentence of that section in regard to the Norris-LaGuardia Act. The gentleman from South Dakota has pointed out that the Norris-LaGuardia Act is affected to some extent by the National Labor Relations Act. I do not think that anybody has made a sufficient study of the Norris-LaGuardia Act to warrant repealing it in any particular or limiting it with respect to the situation with which this section attempts to deal. I think that when we get into tampering with the Norris-LaGuardia Act we do something to which the objections of the gentleman from New York are entirely legitimate. I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan will make votes for this bill. It will prevent lawsuits if the bill passes and it will make a better piece of legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I feel that when the gentleman from Arkansas has concluded—I knew of his desire to speak, having talked with him earlier in the afternoon—that the Committee should rise. Is there any feeling of extreme opposition to that desire on the part of your Chairman?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if we might be advised by the Chair whether or not there are many amendments at the desk pending on the Case amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There are 16 amendments pending. Two of those are to the Adams substitute. I am not sure that all of them will be offered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understand that there are several Members of the House who have an invitation to attend the White House reception this afternoon, in alphabetical series. That applies to both sides of the aisle. I think we ought to let those Members feel that they can go and attend the reception, as much as I would like to proceed.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am informed that there are several Members who have engagements for next Monday that will probably keep them until Thursday. Would they be safe in going ahead with those engagements?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think we can finish tomorrow.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, before I yield further, may I say that my announcement will be very brief, and I hope to discourage a sudden exodus if the agreement to rise is reached.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I understand the conference report on the full employment bill will come up tomorrow. That will take some time. Does the gentleman feel under those circumstances that we are going to be able to vote on this bill tomorrow?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have not been advised that the conference report on the full employment bill is being brought to the floor tomorrow, but I do ask the majority leader if he has any statement to make regarding it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will state now that the conference report on the full employment bill will be the first order of business tomorrow.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, last Friday I made an announcement regarding my intention to submit a substitute for the proposed Case amendment. I included a detailed statement of its purposes. Those of you who had occasion to read it will recall that I based my substitute upon the plan embraced in the Ball-Burton-Hatch bill. On yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 5367, containing in modified form the principles of that measure. However, I have eliminated provisions for compulsory arbitration of class 2 disputes, that is, those pertaining to the making of agreements concerning wages and conditions of employment, and also, I have struck out the provisions relating to reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board—section 13. My bill is similar in some respects to the ones presented by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr.

ADAMS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. Voorhis], but conveys certain enforcement powers upon the Federal Board not found in the other measures. It may be possible to consider some of these provisions as amendments to the pending substitute by the gentleman from New Hampshire. I do not submit it necessarily as a rival measure because I would be glad to see the Adams substitute strengthened and adopted.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am interested to know if the gentleman is opposed to the Case bill?

Mr. HAYS. I am in its present form, yes. As indicated, the substitute which I shall offer is H. R. 5367, and is available in the Chamber. I hope tomorrow to have more to say in elaboration upon this proposal. I should like to point out however, that in giving the Board power to invoke court action to prevent the parties from violating duties imposed by the act, including that of maintaining conditions pending exhaustion of settlement efforts, the bill makes the machinery for peace as effective as possible. Violations of such duties, imposed by section 3 of the bill, by an employee, would deny such employee rights to reinstatement under the Wagner Act and should operate as a real deterrent to grievance strikes. The provisions relating to the settlement of strikes over the application of existing contracts are particularly effective.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. O'NEAL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4908) to provide for the appointment of fact-finding boards to investigate labor disputes seriously affecting the national public interest, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 500, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOWELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a magazine article.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an article by Samuel B. Pettengill, former Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a resolution.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include certain excerpts from articles.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include excerpts.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper editorials.

Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include some excerpts.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 1 hour.

FURTHER EVIDENCE OF OPA INACCURACY

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon on the floor of the House I gave certain information and certain statistics in order to place before you and the Members of the House a clear picture of the propaganda campaign which has been carried on by the OPA in an effort to continue its own existence. I referred to the method, characterizing it as the Hitler-Bowles method. Mr. Speaker, in order that I may place in the RECORD the evidence that this propaganda campaign is not confined exclusively to citrus, which I used as an illustration yesterday, I wish to submit further data at this time on poultry.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I listened to the gentleman yesterday. I am not sure I agree with the gentleman about motives, but I do agree with the gentleman that the selection of the time for the removal of ceilings on citrus fruit and the period during which those ceilings were removed could not have been better chosen, if it had been desired, to try to indicate that the removal of ceilings would be an impractical proposition. I feel as the gentleman does, I believe, that had the ceilings either been removed much earlier or had they been kept off for a longer period, we would have seen much different results from the removal of ceilings on citrus fruit.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman very much.

May I ask the gentleman if he does not agree with me that when the ceilings were removed in November that the OPA in a press release at that time said they would be left off for 60 days?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do not quite agree with the gentleman on that. I think they said they would be suspended for a period of not to exceed 60 days. But I do not think they were precluded from putting them back on in the meantime if they could get an agreement from Judge Collett's office to do so.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I also would ask the gentleman, who is very familiar with the citrus subject, representing a citrus-growing district, and being a member of the Committee on Agriculture, when he finds this situation to exist with citrus, and then finds similar inaccuracies in the figures with relation to poultry, and similar inaccuracies as regards other commodities, does he still think it is all accidental?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; I agree with the gentleman that, for example, on the poultry figures I have not agreed with the OPA cost figures at all because they have omitted any consideration of interest on investment. They have omitted, it seems to me, any consideration of an adequate return to the farmer himself and a number of other things.

THE OPA AND POULTRY STATISTICS

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman very much, because that is the information I am about to put in the RECORD. I go back to a hearing held either before the Committee on Agriculture or before representatives of the poultry groups back in May of this year. I took down the figures very carefully at that time, and they indicated that the net cost to the producer of poultry on the Pacific coast was approximately 1 cent per broiler. Now, a market broiler weighs about 3 pounds; consequently, on an average for the entire west coast, it meant that the profit for the poultry producer was one-third of 1 cent per pound.

In order to arrive at that profit it was necessary for the OPA to take the average of the cost of all producers in the area, and, furthermore, to count in the sales of various items which are produced incident to the production of poultry, including fertilizer. In other words, it was a very rare producer, on the average, who could have made even one-third of one cent.

These were the OPA's own figures. There was no question of them at the time. So when the surplus came in the poultry industry, and recalling Mr. Bowles' own statement, which I placed in the RECORD yesterday, that he intended to take the ceiling off just as soon as any item was in surplus, and that he intended to do it a little too soon rather than a little too late—when that surplus in poultry came about and nothing happened, and the ceilings were not taken off, the Committee on Agriculture, through a subcommittee, of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] was chairman, called representatives of the OPA to the committee room and asked them, "Why not?"

I wish to read, therefore, one or two of the comments made at that meeting. Mr. Bowles was present in person. A statement was read for him, because of a slight throat condition that made it impossible for him to read it himself. It was read by Mr. Timm. After the statement was read, I quote from the transcript:

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, it is a known fact that the OPA's figures are inaccurate.

Mr. Bowles said:

Excuse me for disagreeing, Mr. PHILLIPS.

Mr. PACE said:

I am sure the figures will be checked, and I am quite sure that Mr. Bowles has checked them.

Now, let us see. The gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], who just contributed to what I am now saying on the floor, said:

I would like to ask one specific question. I want to ask whether the figures shown in

the table which you have submitted include any calculation of the farmer's own time, or do they just include his cash output? In other words, when you say in California that there is a margin of profit of 5.4 cents per pound, is there any calculation there for payments for the farmer himself or his own time?

Please note that Mr. Bowles, in that statement on November 14, set up a figure of 5.4 cents per pound profit, although his own statisticians a few months before had shown the profit to be one-third of 1 cent.

The spokesman for Mr. Bowles replied:

The figure includes all costs except the farmer's labor. It includes any hired labor which he has and any interest on his investment.

Please notice that last sentence particularly.

I then said to Mr. Bowles, jokingly, "May I ask Mr. Bowles whether he now agrees or disagrees with me?"

Mr. PACE then proceeded to say that since there was a question regarding these poultry figures, that we take a representative of the OPA, a representative of the Committee on Agriculture, and a representative of the Department of Agriculture and that they analyze Mr. Bowles' statistics. This was done.

Before the committee adjourned, however, Mr. Bowles having already said, through his spokesman, that they did not include the labor of the farmer but they did include hired labor, Mr. Bowles was again asked by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], "Does it include hired labor?" The spokesman said that it included hired labor. There was immediately a little whispered consultation among representatives of the OPA.

The spokesman then said:

No; it does not include hired labor; I am wrong about that.

Let me call to your attention, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that these figures, presented as net profit to the farmer, by the OPA to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives were inaccurate in that they did not include the farmer's labor, the labor of any member of the farmer's family, any hired labor that he may have had to pay for; nor did it include any interest on his investment.

Mr. Speaker, that is so obviously a deliberate misrepresentation that I know no other word by which to designate it. Again, I classify it as the Hitler-Bowles method of propaganda, to secure for the OPA a sort of good will on the part of the housewives of America, who do not understand that by this method their prices have been kept up on any commodity in surplus, rather than kept down.

And, so, Mr. Speaker, finally I should like to submit and have printed in the RECORD a letter from the chairman of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], a distinguished member of the Committee on Agriculture, which he wrote to Mr. Chester Bowles on December 4 as a result of the report made to him by this examining committee of three to which I have already referred. I quote the letter in full:

DEAR MR. BOWLES: You will recall that on November 14 you appeared before and made a statement to the House Committee on

Agriculture with reference to the poultry situation and the advisability of suspending ceiling prices.

You will also recall that several members of the committee questioned the figures you used as the basis for your argument and it was agreed that the committee's attorney, a representative from your office, and a representative from the Department of Agriculture would make an analysis and report on your statement.

I enclose herewith a copy of the analysis of your statement and I am wondering if you will not agree that your statement was misleading, not authorized by the facts, and goes a long way in justifying a statement made to you in the meeting by Congressman JOHN PHILLIPS to the general effect that Members of Congress cannot rely upon the figures issued by the Office of Price Administration.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN PACE,
Member of Congress.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE SHOULD EXAMINE OPA FIGURES

Mr. Speaker, I bring this to the floor today for two reasons: First, that it may be apparent to the Members of Congress that this is not alone a problem of the citrus industry, but that it affects all the figures, all the statistics, all the charts, and all the booklets put out by the OPA for the benefit of the trusting housewives of America; and, second, because beginning Thursday, the Committee on Banking and Currency will begin to hear the OPA, and its first witness will be Mr. Bowles himself. He will without question present some very beautiful charts and some very beautiful figures. My hope is that the Committee on Banking and Currency will do what the Committee on Agriculture did, appoint examiners to examine the figures presented by the OPA.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, after making the request that I may have a reservation to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday next following the special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 102. An act to amend section 2 (b) of the act entitled "An act extending the classified executive civil service of the United States," approved November 26, 1940, so as to provide for counting military service of certain employees of the legislative branch in determining the eligibility of such employees for civil-service status under such act;

S. 765. An act concerning the establishment of meteorological observation stations in the Arctic regions of the Western Hemisphere, for the purpose of improving the weather forecasting service within the United States and on the civil international air transport routes from the United States;

S. 1467. An act to provide for adjustment between the proper appropriations of the unpaid balances in the pay accounts of naval

personnel on the last day of each fiscal year, and for other purposes;

S. 1545. An act to amend article 38 of the Articles for the Government of the Navy; and

S. 1631. An act to provide for the payment on a commuted basis of the costs of transportation of dependents of certain persons entitled to such transportation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; thereupon (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 6, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary has postponed until Thursday, February 7, 1946, the hearing originally scheduled for Wednesday, February 6, 1946, on the bill, H. R. 5089, to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941. The hearing will begin at 10 a. m., and will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m. on Thursday, February 7, 1946, to continue hearings in its study of operations pursuant to the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, in room 1304, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

The Committee on the Census will hold hearings on H. R. 4781 on Thursday morning, February 7, at 10 o'clock, in room 1012.

THE COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold open hearings Thursday, February 7, and Friday, February 8, at 10:30 a. m. on the bills H. R. 2346, H. R. 2180, H. R. 2449, and H. R. 3500.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1034. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation amounting to \$1,144,000 and an increase in a limitation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1947, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 452); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1035. A letter from the Administrator, Surplus Property Administration, transmitting a report on shipyards and facilities; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1036. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to reenact and amend the organic act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their

geographic scope; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

1037. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1 to December 31, 1945, under the appropriation "Compensation of special attorneys, etc., Department of Justice"; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1038. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 540 of title 10 and section 441 (a) of title 34 of the United States Code providing for the detail of United States military and naval missions to foreign governments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1039. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the sixth annual report of the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUNKER:

H. R. 5377. A bill to provide for permanent preservation as historic relics of the silver service, ship's bell, and name plate from the battleship U. S. S. *Nevada*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DE LACY:

H. R. 5378. A bill to authorize the disposal agencies under the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to lend or donate surplus camping equipment to the Boy Scouts of America and other organizations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GIBSON:

H. R. 5379. A bill to amend section 800 (b) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5380. A bill to provide for the conferring of the degree of bachelor of science upon graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 5381. A bill to provide Members of the House of Representatives, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners in Congress with additional copies of the daily edition of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 5382. A bill to establish and maintain in the General Land Office a record of title to all lands held by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 5383. A bill authorizing the construction of a new hospital and diagnostic center in the county of Queens, city and State of New York; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. R. 5384. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River, at a point between the boroughs of Elizabeth, in Elizabeth Township, and West Elizabeth, in Jefferson Township, in the county of Allegheny, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5385. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Monongahela River, at a point between the boroughs of Belle Vernon, in Washington Township, Fayette County, and Speers, in Fallowfield Town-

ship, Washington County, and in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 5386. A bill to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5387. A bill to provide for the construction of a bridge across the Monongahela River; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 5388. A bill authorizing the transportation of the wives and children of enlisted men of the Army or the Army of the United States of all grades to the stations without the continental limits of the United States of their husbands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 5389. A bill to amend the National Housing Act by adding thereto a new title to provide for a housing expediter and to define his powers, providing for the allocation of building materials for the construction of homes, providing for preference to veterans of World War II in the purchase or rental of housing accommodations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Res. 507. Resolution to amend clause 4 of rule XXVII of the Rules of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 508. Resolution authorizing the printing as a public document of a revised edition of House Document No. 228, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Our American Government: What Is It? How Does It Function?"; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States and certain Federal governmental departments to take steps to alleviate the shortage of buildings and office space in California cities for veterans of World War II engaged in business and professions; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to discontinue the practice of the Fair Employment Practice Commission; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kentucky, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to establish a floor price for tobacco; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 5390. A bill to suspend deportation of Domenico Marozzo and record his admission for permanent residence; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 5391. A bill for the relief of Ann Maureen Bell; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

H. R. 5392. A bill for the relief of Bruno Benedetto Zevi; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 5393. A bill for the relief of Earl F. Hentzy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 5394. A bill for the relief of San Diego Gas & Electric Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5395. A bill for the relief of Leonard C. Clark and Elizabeth Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5396. A bill for the relief of Carl L. Rosso and Josephine A. Rosso; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 5397. A bill for the relief of Nels L. Olson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 5398. A bill for the relief of Walter J. Barnes Electric Co. and Maritime Electric Co., Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 5399. A bill for the relief of Sarkis Mugrdichian; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1522. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. G. S. Gunderson, president, Lutheran Ladies Aid, Baltic, S. Dak., and 41 other signers, urging enactment of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio and interstate transmission of periodicals containing alcoholic-beverage advertisements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1523. Also, petition of Mrs. Olaf Brenden, of Garretson, S. Dak., and 20 other signers, urging enactment of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio or interstate transmission of periodicals containing alcoholic-beverage advertisements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1524. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of Charlie Chastain and other citizens of Stone County, Mo., urging the passage of the Poage bill or H. R. 1742; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1525. Also, petition of J. B. Manka and other citizens of Lawrence County, Mo., urging the passage of the H. R. 1742 or the Poage bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1526. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Minnesota District of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the President and Congress of the United States to take the necessary steps so that the services of UNRRA be extended to include all the needy people in the occupied territories; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1527. Also, petition of the board of directors, the Texas Cotton Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the pending loan to Great Britain; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1528. Also, petition of the Fifty-fourth Assembly District Democratic Club, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Congress continuing price control for a period not less than 2 years; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1946

(Legislative day of Friday, January 18, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with whom there is no shadow that is caused by turning, con-

scious that in the rough and rushing world there is upon us constantly the hot breath of malice and envy, of evil tempers and thoughts, in this quiet moment of devotion, breathe on us, breath of God, fanning to flame our smoldering faith that the cross which weights the wings of our spirits may be consumed.

As those into whose unworthy hands has been placed the crying needs of stricken humanity, may the thoughts of our minds and the sympathies of our hearts, the words of our lips, and the decisions of our deliberations be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our Redeemer. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 490. An act to authorize the sale of the allotment of Henry Keiser on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.;

S. 815. An act for the relief of Ogden & Dougherty, and for other purposes;

S. 831. An act for the relief of James Alves Saucier;

S. 845. An act for the relief of Mabel Fowler;

S. 905. An act for the relief of Harold E. Bullock;

S. 991. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Marion M. Hill;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of Oscar S. Reed;

S. 1081. An act for the relief of Aftab Ali;

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Florence Barrows;

S. 1158. An act for the relief of Winter Bros. Co.;

S. 1231. An act for the relief of Paul E. Tacy;

S. 1294. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Allan F. Walker;

S. 1296. An act for the relief of John A. Hatcher;

S. 1323. An act for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones;

S. 1338. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Wayne Edward Wilson, a minor;

S. 1360. An act to compensate Benali El Oukili Boucheta, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for the wrongful death of his son Mohamed Ben Boucheta Ben Ali El Oukili, near Marnia, Algeria, on September 30, 1944;

S. 1361. An act to compensate Clement Euziere, an inhabitant of French Morocco, for personal injuries caused by a naval vehicle near Oran, Algeria, on September 21, 1943;

S. 1448. An act for the relief of William Wilson Wurster; and

S. 1590. An act to authorize the President to appoint Graves Blanchard Erskine, major general, United States Marine Corps, to the office of Retraining and Reemployment Administrator, without affecting his service status and perquisites.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 314. An act for the relief of Sigurdur Jonsson and Thorolína Thordardóttir;